DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 939 SO 002 458

AUTHOR Wight, Albert R.; And Others
TITLE Guidelines for Peace Corps Cross-Cultural Training. Part III. Supplementary Readings.
INSTITUTION Center for Research and Education, Estes Park, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY Peace Corps (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 108p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *American Culture; Communication Problems; *Cross Cultural Training; Cultural Awareness; Culture Conflict; *Foreign Culture; *Intercultural Programs; Interdisciplinary Approach; *International Programs; Sociocultural Patterns; Supplementary Reading Materials
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Corps

ABSTRACT

Reproduced in this document are 17 articles for both trainees and trainers during phases of Peace Corps training programs presented in related documents: SO 002 456 and SO 002 457. They are ordered in a sequence that reflects program development. The first article, An Alternative to the University Model, by Harrison and Hopkins, describes experiential training, its problems, objectives, and rewards. The Hall and Whyte article and Lee article describes the complexity and requirements of cross-cultural communication. The Leach and Bowen articles describe the same problems from an individual's perspective. Rhinesmitt and Hoopes' article describe reactions to a new culture. Oberg's and Dubois's articles describe culture shock. Several articles deal with American and Western culture. The Stewart article provides a summary of the more important cultural concepts. The articles on American culture by Miner, Linton, Montana, and Latham give slightly unexpected visions of American society. Articles by Vithal, Hatch, Cousins, and Carter focus on the Peace Corps Volunteer role, the particular difficulties he faces, the strengths he can bring, and the adaptions he can make. The articles were chosen for their relevance to community development work anywhere in the world. Another related document is: SO 002 459. (Author/DJB)

ED 059939

3558

SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM
NOT TO BE REMOVED FROM LIBRARY

GUIDELINES

for

IN PROJECT
BOX # 1

PEACE CORPS CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

PART III
SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

Albert R. Wight
Mary Anne Hammons
William L. Wight

SE 003 458

OFFICE OF TRAINING SUPPORT, PEACE CORPS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Published under contract by
CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION
[illegible]

[illegible]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDELINES FOR PEACE CORPS CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING

Part III

Supplementary Readings

Albert R. Wight
Mary Anne Hammons
William L. Wight

OFFICE OF TRAINING SUPPORT
PEACE CORPS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Published under Contract No. PC-25-1710

by

Center for Research and Education
P. O. Box 1768
Estes Park, Colorado 80517

March 1970

SEE ALSO:

Part I Philosophy and Methodology

Part II Specific Methods and Techniques

Part IV Annotated Bibliography

This handbook may be reproduced, wholly or in part, by the U. S. Government, its officers, agents, and employees acting within the scope of their official duties. This handbook may not be reproduced by other parties, wholly or in part, without permission from the cognizant office of the Peace Corps.

SELECTED READINGS

Preface

The articles included here are intended as Readings for both trainers and trainees. All have proven of great value in past programs. Many conceptualize particularly difficult ideas or systems. Training staffs are encouraged to use them as they see fit, and to add the many others they find of particular benefit. We would, of course, appreciate hearing of any additions the reader might suggest.

The articles are arranged in a rough sequence that generally reflects program development. The first article, An Alternative to the University Model, for example, is an excellent description of experiential training, its problems, objectives and rewards. We would urge that the entire training staff study the document, and that it be made available to trainees at a time when they are prepared to further explore and conceptualize the Experiential Learning Model.

The Hall and Whyte article on "Intercultural Communication," and Lee's "Cultural Curtain" describe some of the complexity and requirements of communicating across cultures. The Leach and Bowen articles describe the same problems from the more emotional and personal view of the individual caught in a cultural confrontation.

Rhinesmith and Hoopes have described effectively the usual reactions ("flight," "fight," or "adaptation") to a new culture. This article could be used as an introduction to a third-culture experience, as a basis for a human relations laboratory, or for a series of Critical Incidents or case studies (see Section B for examples of this use).

Oberg's and DuBois's excellent description of culture shock can help the trainee to prepare for this phenomenon, understand some of its limits, and begin to learn how to deal with it.

We have included a series of articles on American or Western culture. The longest of these is a summary of many of the more important concepts developed by Ed Stewart et. al., a firm and comprehensive basis for planning any contrastive or analytical studies of our culture. Some ways of doing this are suggested in Section C of Part II.

The articles on American culture by Miner, Linton, Montana, and Latham are brief, thought-provoking, and give slightly unexpected visions of our society.

The last articles by Vithal, Hatch, Cousins and Carter, focus on the Volunteer role, the particular difficulties he faces, the strengths he can bring, and the adaptations he can make. Although most are written for a specific culture, all are relevant to service anywhere in the world. Many of the ideas in the Hatch article could also be considered by the language or technical people.

Several of the authors mentioned here have assumed new responsibilities since these articles were published. Richard Hopkins is now Vice President, Instructional Sciences and Training Systems, Westinghouse Learning Corporation. Roger Harrison is a consultant with Development Research Associates, and several Boston-area projects. Jerry Leach is believed to be a Senior Tutor in Anthropology at the University of Papua, Port Moresby, New Guinea. We would also like to add our acknowledgement to Doubleday for permitting use of the excerpt from Return to Laughter, and our appreciation for the permission from the author, Laura Bohannan, who copyrighted the book in 1954. We must apologize to Ralph Linton, author of "100% American," for failing to note that the article appeared in The Study of Man, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1936, pp. 325-7.

THE DESIGN OF CROSS-CULTURAL TRAINING: AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE UNIVERSITY MODEL[1]

Roger Harrison and Richard L. Hopkins[2]

The inapplicability of traditional university-based training has become a chronic complaint in organizations which must prepare large numbers of persons for service overseas. In the Peace Corps, for example, which in almost seven years now has trained more persons for overseas work than any other civilian government agency, complaints about the irrelevance of traditional classroom training have been growing steadily since the first Volunteers entered training. (The Peace Corps continues to train most of its Volunteers at universities, for a variety of reasons not having to do with the quality of training; but a vigorous effort is made to influence the training institutions to design programs that differ sharply from the standard curriculum design.)

The complaints are not directed toward the content of the traditional academic disciplines that bear on overseas work. The content can be relevant to performance in an alien culture; moreover, the acknowledged experts in the subject matter fields appropriate to overseas work are found in universities and colleges for the most part. The dissatisfaction is with the ways in which such subject matter is taught.

When returned Peace Corps Volunteers talk about their training, they do not complain about incompetent professors; they complain about the sense in which their experiences in training, however interesting or well presented they may have been, simply did not prepare them for the total life they had to lead overseas. Despite the overall success of the Peace Corps, it has not been uncommon for even a "good" Volunteer to take five or six months, or one-fourth of his tour overseas, to become fully operational in an overseas environment.

Now prospective Peace Corps Volunteers are highly motivated students, keenly aware that their success in a strange and alien environment will depend in large measure on their ability to deal with the dynamics of the culture in which they will be working. Above average in commitment to their work, energetic, imaginative, and intelligent, they exhibit a happy blend of attitudes and motives. Yet, primed for a really stirring training experience as they are, many of those who have completed their two years abroad seem unusually dissatisfied with the training that preceded their overseas tour. Somehow training had little more bearing on what actually happened to them overseas than the rest of their middle class life experiences, including their experiences in college prior to the Peace Corps.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the basis for such discontent by dissecting the relationships between the ends and means of training for cross-cultural performance. The conclusion to which the analysis leads is that the traditional methods of higher education simply will not get the job done. Nor are they well suited to training for any

---

[1]Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Volume 3, Number 4, 1967, pp. 431-460.

[2]Roger Harrison, formerly Program Director, NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, is now Consultant in Organization Development, Education and Training, and Evaluation Research, Washington, D. C. Richard L. Hopkins, former Director of the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico, is now General Manager, Government Division, Instructional Services Group, Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Bladensburg, Maryland.

application situation that requires the ability to adapt to or to act in unfamiliar and ambiguous social situations. (Included in this category would be all types of community development or community action work, at home or abroad, especially when such work is with the disadvantaged, as well as work in institutional subcultures that differ basically from the "outside world.")

Further objectives of this paper are to present a conception of some learning processes that can lead to the ability to cope with ambiguity and to take action under stress, to present some design principles for such training, and to specify the kinds of skills and competence needed to design and operate effective cross-cultural training programs. Finally, the paper details a Peace Corps training program in which some of these design principles were tested.

- - - - - - - -

The Problem of Education for Overseas Work. With few exceptions, formal systems of higher education in the United States provide training in the manipulation of symbols rather than of things; reliance on thinking rather than on feeling and intuition; and commitment to understanding rather than to action. These systems were designed originally for the training of scholars, researchers, and professionals, for whom rationality, abstract knowledge, emotional detachment, and verbal skills are primary values. These systems, however, are applied across the board to almost all students, regardless of individual occupational goals. The criteria of performance used to evaluate the effectiveness of the traditional educational experience are familiar to all of us. They consist of tests, papers, reports, and the evaluation of performance on laboratory problems. With few exceptions, these methods of evaluation are verbal and intellectual.

There are attempts to provide action-oriented and experience-based learning models in many institutions of higher learning, but these less intellectual and more emotionally involving learning settings tend to be peripheral and ancillary to the main work of the college or university. Student governments and student organizations, for example, have an ambiguous, unintegrated relationship to the faculty and the classroom. The status of Deans of Students and Directors of Student Activities is cloudy when it is not second-class. The classroom remains a stronghold of rationality.

How the Traditional University Model Fails. When colleges or universities are approached to design or conduct training for work overseas, the resources made available to work on the problem are often those of the traditional part of the organization. Training design is usually based upon the university model.

Unitl quite recently, for example, the typical Peace Corps university training program was chopped up into components which conformed, by and large, to university departmental lines, and time was assigned to each component on an hourly-bloc basis: so much to language, so much to technical studies, so much to area studies, and so on. Such a program was more than likely conducted in an environment that differed little from the one the trainee had just escaped, with all or most of its in loco parentis rules and regulations, its classrooms and blackboards, its textbooks and reading lists, its blue-book examinations, its air-conditioned dormitories and student-union atmosphere.

In many of these programs the environment was restrictive and authoritarian, a kind of exhausting endurance contest, which the trainee survived by a sort of game-playing designed to get him through the Peace Corps' selection process as painlessly as possible. Recognizing the something ought to be different in a Peace Corps program, university project directors typically designed programs that ran from dawn to dark--and beyond--up to as much as 65 or 70 hours a week of intensive instruction for 11 to 15 weeks. Thus, although one of the prime objectives of training was to convince the prospective Volunteer that he was no longer a college student, he was placed in a training environment where he was treated as one.

In any case, the goals and methods of this model focus upon the development of the student's intellectual capacity and on a certain kind of gamemanship that enables him to cope with the training program. There is no manifest concern with his feelings, with an ideal behavior model, or with the interpersonal aspects of the work he may be doing. Students in a typical university setting spend most of their time reading and writing, more time talking about ideas than acting on them; and their professors are much more interested in students' ideas than in their feelings. To be emotional as opposed to being rational and objective, at least in the classroom, is to transgress the bounds of appropriate student or professorial behavior.

Universities and colleges do succeed in influencing students to move toward the traditional goals. Students do become more rational, more critical, more detached, and more adept at the manipulation of words, symbols, and abstractions. In terms of the desired outcome of training for cross-cultural work, the university model can provide an intellectual understanding of cultural diversity, of values and assumptions that differ from their own.

The Missing Interpersonal Links. Nothing in this paper should be construed as suggesting that this kind of understanding is of no value or that it is totally irrelevant to overseas work. It does not, however, provide a trainee with all he needs overseas. Its weakness is that in those aspects of overseas performance having to do with interpersonal effectiveness the traditional model offers little help. This is a serious weakness. The experiences of all our overseas agencies--private, governmental, religious--have demonstrated that the human elements of overseas work are at least as important as the technical ones in the success of a job or mission, and that overseas personnel are much more likely to be deficient in these human aspects of work performance than in technical skills.[3]

The gravest problems of Peace Corps Volunteers, said David Riesman in a recent seminar on the Peace Corps as an educative experience, are "emotional and interpersonal."

By interpersonal effectiveness we mean such functions as establishing and maintaining trust and communication, motivating and influencing, consulting and advising--all that complex of activities designed to inculcate change. In overseas jobs, the performance of these relationship activities must take place across differences in values, in ways of perceiving and thinking, and in cultural norms and expectations.

Divergent Goals Detailed. These requirements suggest a very different set of goals from those of the university model. To sharpen the contrast, here are some important and divergent goals of the two educational enterprises.

Some Major Goals of University Education	Some Divergent Goals of Overseas Education
Communication: To communicate fluently via the written word and, to a lesser extent, to speak well. To master the languages of abstraction and generalization, e.g. mathematics and science. To understand readily the reasoning, the ideas, and the knowledge of other persons through verbal exchange.	Communication: To understand and communicate directly and often non-verbally through movement, facial expression, person-to-person actions. To listen with sensitivity to the hidden concerns, values, motives of the other. To be at home in the exchange of feelings, attitudes, desires, fears. To have a sympathetic, empathic understanding of the feelings of the other.

[3]For an excellent review and statement of these human problems, see Foster, R. Examples of cross-cultural problems encountered by Americans overseas--Instructor's Handbook. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Office, May 1965.

Decision Making: To develop critical judgment: the ability to test assertions, assumptions, and opinions against the hard facts and the criteria of logic. To reduce susceptibility to specious argument and to be skeptical of intuition and emotion. To search for the best, most rational, most economical, and elegant solution.	Decision Making: To develop ability to come to conclusions and take action on inadequate, unreliable, and conflicting information. To be able to trust feelings, attitudes, and beliefs as well as facts. To search for the possible course, the viable alternative, the durable though inelegant solution.
Commitment: Commitment is to the truth. It requires an ability to stand back from ongoing events in order to understand and analyze them and to maintain objectivity in the fact of emotionally involving situations. Difficult situations are handled by explanations, theories, reports.	Commitment: Commitment is to people and to relationships. It requires an ability to become involved: to be able to give and inspire trust and confidence, to care and to take action in accordance with one's concern. Difficult situations are dealt with by staying in emotional contact with them and by trying to take constructive action.
Ideals: To value the great principles and ideals of Western society: social justice, economic progress, scientific truth. To value the sacrifice of present rewards and satisfactions for future advancement of these ideals and to find self-esteem and satisfaction from one's contribution toward distant social goals.	Ideals: To value causes and objectives embedded in the here-and-now and embodied in the groups and persons in the immediate social environment. To find satisfaction, enjoyment, and self-esteem from the impact one has directly on the lives of others. To be able to empathize with others who live mostly in the present and to work with them toward the limited, concrete goals which are important to them.
Problem Solving: A problem is solved when the true, correct, reasonable answer has been discovered and verified. Problem solving is a search for knowledge and truth. It is a largely rational process, involving intelligence, creativity, insight, and a respect for facts.	Problem Solving: A problem is solved when decisions are made and carried out which effectively apply people's energies to overcoming some barrier to a common goal. Problem solving is a social process involving communication, interpersonal influence, consensus, and commitment.

Even though the goals on the left are not universally honored in American colleges and universities, they do represent a spirit or ideal of academic excellence. They have a pervasive influence on the values and behavior of educators. They are important goals that have contributed much to our civilization. The transfer of these goals from generation to generation is not the least important function of higher education. The trouble is that they are often not relevant in an action situation.

The goals on the right above are typical of the aims of Americans working closely with counterparts in overseas situations. They are not universal, but they represent the reach and thrust of many persons who are concerned and active in the improvement of overseas effectiveness. These goals are also operative in a number of domestic programs, especially in community development activities.

Contrasting Learning Styles or Meta-Goals. University education and cross-cultural training are sharply different, too, in what Schein and Bennis (1965) have called the "meta-goals" of training. Meta-goals are approaches to learning and personal development which the learner acquires in the process of being educated in a particular system. In other words, meta-goals represent what the learner learns, in addition to the content of instruction, about how to approach and solve subsequent problems outside the classroom.

They represent the problem-solving processes, the learning styles, which the trainee or student becomes committed to in the course of his educational experience. Meta-goals have to do with "learning how to learn." In some learning settings, for example, an authoritative person acts as the source of solutions to problems, while in others the learner must look to peers or to himself for information and suggestions. Such differences can be critical in overseas work.

Below are listed some meta-goals of university education, contrasted with meta-goals which seem appropriate for the cross-cultural situation.

Meta-Goals of Traditional College and University Classrooms	Appropriate Meta-Goals for Cross-Cultural Training
Source of Information: Information comes from experts and authoritative sources through the media of books, lectures, audio-visual presentations. "If you have a question, look it up."	Source of Information: Information sources must be developed by the learner from the social environment. Information-gathering methods include observation and questioning of associates, other learners, and chance acquaintances.
Learning Settings: Learning takes place in settings designated for the purpose, e.g., classrooms and libraries.	Learning Settings: The entire social environment is the setting for learning. Every human encounter provides relevant information.
Problem-Solving Approaches: Problems are defined and posed to the learner by experts and authorities. The correct problem-solving methods are specified, and the student's work is checked for application of the proper method and for accuracy, or at least for reasonableness of results. The emphasis is on solutions to known problems.	Problem-Solving Approaches: The learner is on his own to define problems, generate hypotheses, and collect information from the social environment. The emphasis is on discovering problems and developing problem-solving approaches on the spot.
Role of Emotions and Values: Problems are largely dealt with at an ideational level. Questions of reason and of fact are paramount. Feelings and values may be discussed but are rarely acted upon.	Role of Emotions and Values: Problems are usually value- and emotion-laden. Facts are often less relevant than the perceptions and attitudes which people hold. Values and feelings have action consequences, and action must be taken.
Criteria of Successful Learning: Favorable evaluation by experts and authorities of the quality of the individual's intellectual productions, primarily written work.	Criteria of Successful Learning: The establishment and maintenance of effective and satisfying relationships with others in the work setting. This includes the ability to communicate with and influence others. Often there are no criteria available other than the attitudes of the parties involved in the relationship.

At the level of meta-goals, university education and cross-cultural training diverge significantly. The sources, settings, and approaches of the former tend to be formal, bookish, rational, dependent on authority, and lacking in opportunities to gain competence in learning through interpersonal contact.

Need for freedom to learn independently. They differ profoundly along the dimension of freedom. It is here that the inappropriateness of traditional educational systems for overseas work is most evident. The high degree of control and dependence upon authority

common in the college classroom does not lead to the development of a learning style facilitative of success in an overseas environment. This is not just because freedom is a good thing and everyone ought to have a lot of it. It is because so much external control implies a dependency on experts and authorities for direction, information, and validation. When the learner is deprived of these sources of support, as he is almost certain to be in the overseas environment, he is in an uncomfortable and sometimes emotionally crippling situation. He not only must solve new problems in a new setting, but he must develop a new learning style, quite on his own. This experience--not knowing how to learn without traditional supports--may be productive of a good deal of the anxiety and depression grouped under the rubric, "culture shock." It is certainly responsible for much individual failure, even when it does not lead to chronic depression and anomie.

Education for cross-cultural applications should train the individual in a system of learning operations that is independent of settings, persons, and other information sources not found in the overseas environment. If the trainee can be educated to be an effective and independent learner, he need not be filled with all the information he can contain before going into his new job. He will have the capacity to generate his own learning as needed. Indeed, he will have to generate his own learning in any case, whether he is trained to do this or not, for the simple reason that no training agency can train for every exotic contingency, for every aspect of life and work in another culture.

Risks of emotional encounter. The other dimension on which the two learning models described above differ is that of encounter--the extent to which the emotions, values, and deeper aspects of the self are actively involved, touched, and changed in the learning process. The intellectuality and the formality, the emphasis on ideas and on the written word, the appeals to logic and reason implicit in university education, all combine to encourage an emotional distance from the learning material and a relativism about values.

But it is not possible to maintain such emotional distance from the sights, the smells, the sounds, and the customs of an alien culture. (And for one who is attempting to effect change or to act as an advisor in another culture, it is certainly not desirable, either.) Those aspects of life which in one's own culture are familiar and which would be supportive if they were present overseas (eating habits, standards of hygiene and cleanliness, language, social systems, subliminally perceived signals of all kinds) are not present; and their absence is emotionally disruptive. One's assumptions and values are called into question again and again by the most trivial kinds of events. The interpersonal competencies that work well in one's own culture suddenly do not work any more. The cues are different. One can avoid the encounter only by retreating into some kind of physical or emotional enclave, into the kinds of American compounds that wall off "Yankees" from "natives" all over the world.

Education in the classroom teaches one to deal with emotionally loaded questions of value and attitude by analyzing and talking about them in an atmosphere of emotional detachment. Such a scholarly, scientific attitude is appropriate to the task of understanding; but by sidestepping direct, feeling-level involvement with issues and persons, one fails to develop the "emotional muscle" needed to handle effectively a high degree of emotional impact and stress. Lacking "emotional muscle," the individual under stress tends to withdraw as much as possible from exposure of his self-esteem or, at the other extreme, he impulsively risks too much in an effort to get the anxiety and suspense over with. Either of these reactions to stress can, and often does, lead to failure overseas. Thus an important objective in training for overseas work should be the development in the trainee of the ability and willingness to take moderate emotional risks in situations where his sense of self-esteem is involved.

The concept of moderate risk taking can be illustrated by examining the alternatives one faces when a friend or colleague has become noticeably unapproachable, cold, and unresponsive. The alternative actions one may take may be classified as low-, moderate,-

or high-risk, according to which emotional impact is likely to result to one's self-esteem. Low-risk alternatives might include withdrawal from the relationship or resort to written rather than oral communication. High-risk alternatives might include retaliation with some kind of personal attack on the colleague, reproaches for his unfriendliness, or demands to his face that he change his behavior. The low- and high-risk approaches allow the causes of the situation to remain unknown and not dealt with. They are designed more to ease the tension and uncertainty than to solve the problem.

In contrast, the moderate-risk approach is characterized by a willingness to increase tension somewhat in order to obtain information about the difficulty. Such an approach might take the form of asking the other person if there were anything the matter; indicating that one was puzzled about the behavior of the other; trying to arrange increased interaction in nonwork settings to see whether a relationship could be built on some more personal foundation; and so on. The important thing is not that these attempts be successful in resolving the problem but that they develop more information about it with low risk of further damage to the relationship. They also all involve some increase in tension for the subject, since failure might be painful. Moderate-risk approaches require more ability to stand emotional tension over a period of time than do the others.

The ability to deal directly with a high degree of emotional impact is not likely to be developed in the university classroom. The kinds of problems dealt with in the classroom neither require nor reward attempts to turn the learning situation into an opportunity for interpersonal encounter.

In summary, then, the classroom approach is poorly adapted to training persons to operate in settings, overseas or anywhere else, where they must define and attack problems without the aid of authoritative or expert assistance (freedom), and where the degree of emotional, attitudinal, and value involvement is so high as to require dealing directly and continually with emotionally laden issues (encounter).

An Alternative Model for Cross-Cultural Training

Design principles for cross-cultural training differ from those of the university classroom. The purposes of the former are to: (1) develop in the student more independence of external sources of decision, information, problem definition, and motivation; (2) develop in the student the "emotional muscle" he needs to deal constructively with the strong feelings which are created by conflict and confrontation of values and attitudes; (3) enable him to make choices and commitments to action in situations of stress and uncertainty; and (4) encourage him to use his own and others' feelings, attitudes, and values as information in defining and solving human problems.

There are a number of design principles which follow directly from these aims and goals.

Problem solving. The individual should be continually exposed to situations that require him to diagnose what is going on, define a problem to solve, devise a solution, and take action upon it. Because information and theory which are not used in the problem-solving process will not be readily available to the learner when he must solve problems under stress, information is not presented which is irrelevant to the solution of real problems which the learner is asked to solve in the here-and-now.

Immediate data orientation. Immediate data are data gathered by observation of the physical environment and experience with persons involved in some problem, as distinguished from second-hand and abstract information obtained from experts and authorities. Learning to use immediate data, particularly from the social environment, frees the learner from dependence on authoritative sources of information. In cross-cultural training designs, problems should be constructed so that their definition and solution require the problem solver to develop information from the persons who are present with him in the problem situation.

Value orientation. Almost any action a person takes in a culture other than his own involves a confrontation between his values and those of the host country. In the marketplace, in work situations, in businesses, in social relations of all kinds, the visitor abroad must confront and cope with unfamiliar values and customs. Thus the problems which the learner deals with in training should also require a confrontation with opposing values. Furthermore, it is not enough that the learner examine these value conflicts with interest and detachment. In the cross-cultural application situation he will not be able to escape choices among conflicting values. The choices he makes will have important consequences. Therefore, in the training situation the learner should be confronted with problem-solving situations forcing him to make choices among competing values which have consequences for his relationships with others in the training situation.

Experience-action orientation. A basic problem in cross-cultural training design may be stated inelegantly as "connecting head and guts." This means that training designs which lead only to understanding are never good enough. Training problems must require that the person experience the emotional impact of the phenomena with which he is dealing, as well as understand them. He must be able to translate ideas and values into direct action, with all the attendant risks and difficulties. This requires that the learner influence others to action.

The principle, then, is that training situations should require that discussion and analysis lead to decision and action on the part of the trainee. This would imply, for example, that even the best led "discussion group" is only half a training situation, because it does not lead to action.

Use of authority. The authority of the educator or trainer should not be used to diagnose situations, define problems, provide information, or select alternative courses of action for the learner. If these functions are performed for the learner, he learns through dependency on expert or authoritative help.

On the other hand, plunges into anarchy and laissez faire may so traumatize the learner that he must spend most of his energy in defending himself emotionally from the learning situation. If he is allowed to, he may defend himself by side-stepping confrontation with problems and the hard work on their definition and solution which is the heart of the learning process as we have prescribed it. A delicate and unusual use of authority is thus called for.

It is clear that authority must not be used to deprive the learner of the opportunity to have his own experience. In general, he is not provided with information, but encouraged to seek it; he is not given solutions, but asked to come to conclusions on his own; he is not told what action to take or how to take it, only that action is expected of him.

Authority is used to support the learner in his first steps in an unfamiliar learning environment. At the same time, he is not left completely without sources of help. He is encouraged to experiment, to try and fail and try again, to take risks, to express himself and his values in words and action. He is rewarded by those in authority, not for succeeding or getting the right answer or expressing the right opinion, but for engaging actively and wholeheartedly in the learning process.

The restrictive side of this use of authority is that the learner is to some extent "fenced in" to keep him in contact with the problems he is expected to solve. Sanctions or punishments are applied, not for "goofing up" but for "goofing off"; not for making mistakes but for failing to act; not for taking an illogical or unreasonable position but for failure to take a stand.

Use of expertise. A premise of this model is that a person does not learn to exist effectively in another culture simply by being provided with information about that culture. Although we can predict to some extent the general types of difficulties the

learner will have to face in the cross-cultural situation, we cannot predict with any certainty the exact information which he will need to solve the particular difficulties challenging him.

We can, however, specify the conceptual framework which the learner needs to make sense of an alien and ambiguous social situation, and to take action in that situation. The learner's need for expert help is less to provide information about the content of the other culture than to teach the problem-solving processes and to develop the feeling-thinking linkages which are primary goals of our proposed training designs.

The expert interacts with the learner first through designing situations constructed so that as the learner follows his own natural adaptive styles he will be confronted with the processes and problems which it is desired that he assimilate. These are "free movement" situations in that the learner's specific actions and activities are only loosely prescribed: he is free to solve the problem in almost any way he chooses.

Further, the educator should help the learner reflect about his experience. The process of linking thought and feeling is as difficult when one begins with a concrete problem and moves toward conceptualization of the experience as it is when one starts with ideas and facts and tries to move toward action based upon an intellectual analysis. The educator does not simply construct problems and then sit back while the learner runs through a maze like a rat. At the very least, the educator should ask the learner what meaning the experience had for him and what, if any, connections and generalizations he can make between this particular experience and what he knows about himself, his goals in the cross-cultural situation, his own culture and the alien culture. His role is that of any teacher working intuitively--to ask the right questions at the right time. Without this kind of guidance, it is just as possible for a person to have an experience-packed and emotionally laden but conceptually meaningless learning experience as it is for him to have an intellectualized and detached but emotionally bland one.

It is not unusual, for example, for returned Peace Corps Volunteers working as staff in a Peace Corps training program to see their overseas career as a kind of kaleidoscope of impactful, difficult, rewarding, but essentially unconnected, experiences. The returned Volunteer often does not have a clear conception of the processes which he used to adapt himself to the culture, to develop sources of information, or to formulate and test hypotheses about problems. When he communicates to trainees he often communicates at the level of "war stories." These anecdotes usually have as their implied message, "It's no use to prepare for much of anything, because whatever you expect, it is not going to come out as you anticipated."

Many of these veterans of the real world seem not to have been able to turn their own experience into real learning or to make it available as training for others. They have been through an experienced-based learning situation in their overseas assignment without learning anything which they see as clearly transferable to other social situations. They have not been able to conceptualize their experiences, partly because they were not taught how to do so during their training period. But of course learning has occurred; it is latent, waiting for some structured conceptual framework into which it may be fitted in a coherent way.

The purpose of experience-based cross-cultural training is to inculcate somehow in the learner the ability to see and know what he is learning and has learned, so that he can articulate it afterwards and act on his learning consciously. The role prescribed for the teacher, the educator, in such a learning system is one of aiding in an inductive rather than the traditional deductive learning process. He helps the learner to verbalize his feelings, perceptions, and experiences and to draw conclusions and generalizations from them. If the teacher succeeds, the trainee will not only be more successful in the field situation; the entire experience will become a richer and more rewarding one for him. He will, in one degree or another, have learned something about how to learn.

Training Settings. The principles of training enunciated here have been applied in an actual training situation. During the summer and fall of 1965 the authors collaborated--one as project director, the other as consultant--in the design and implementation of two community development training programs at the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico. The two programs will be referred to as one program: They were planned together, operated under the same design, and ran concurrently, although the training that is described took place at only one camp.

The Peace Corps Training Center consists of two camps located in a semi-rain forest area of central Puerto Rico about 15 miles from the coastal city of Arecibo. Each camp has a capacity of about 110 trainees. Trainees live in simple wooden cabins. There is no indoor plumbing or hot water. Nature is kind (despite 140 inches of rain a year), but life is primitive.

The camps were utilized until the fall of 1964 as so-called Outward Bound camps, where trainees were received before or after university training for three or four weeks of rigorous, graduated physical activities designed to confront trainees with challenges which stretched their capacity to deal with stress. In September 1964, however, after a small pilot project, the camps were converted into a full-scale training center for Latin America. Since that time only full-length (10-12 weeks' duration) training programs have been conducted there.

In the summer of 1965, the staff of the Training Center consisted of a director; five assistant directors; four psychologists responsible for trainee assessment; an administrative officer; an associate administrative officer and 30 maintenance workers and cooks; two nurses; about 15 native-speaking language informants; and finally, approximately 30 former PCV's from Latin America (average age 25), who comprised the core instructional and coordinating staff. The resident staff was supplemented in each cycle by 12 to 20 academicians and technicians who came to the Training Center for stays of three to ten days each.

The remainder of this paper will draw heavily on the training program. But it should be understood that it was not conducted under rigorous laboratory conditions. No systematic effort was made to collect objective data while it was going on. Two projects were involved:

The Ecuador RCA/Colonization Project included 40 trainees--two recently graduated engineers, eight nurses, and 30 so-called B. A. generalists. They were to work in newly colonized areas of the Oriente region of Ecuador as elementary teachers or technicians and, what is most important, as community development workers.

The Latin American Regional Arts and Crafts Project included 42 trainees, all artisans (weavers, potters, metal workers, painters, and so on), several of them graduates of art schools or technical institutes. They were to be divided among three countries--Ecuador, Chile, and Bolivia--where they would work with native artisans in developing exportable handicraft items through the organization and administration of producer cooperatives.

As in all Peace Corps training programs, these trainees were subject to the Peace Corps' selection process. Eighty-two trainees reported for training; fifty-seven were sent overseas. Twenty-five trainees, in other words, either resigned or were, as the Peace Corps euphemism goes, "selected out."

In previous programs at the Puerto Rico Center, the director's authority role had been that of a traditional academic administrator. He designed the curriculum, scheduled all training activities, and left the subject matter to the faculty. For the most part, material was presented in the standard way: the instructors talked; the trainees listened, took notes, and asked questions. In this case, though, the young staff was offered autonomy and the chance to design and conduct its own program. The director and consultant would be on hand to participate as they were wanted; they would advise and make comments, but they would not run things. Responsibility lay within the staff itself.

Ultimately only about one-third of the staff accepted this offer of autonomy. They planned the experimental program over a period of about six weeks, meeting for several hours daily seven days a week. At the end, they were ready to take the risks involved in a model that differed significantly from the training they had received before their Peace Corps tours, and which also differed from that previously conducted at the Training Center.

General Characteristics. The training program, as it was designed, was to have these general characteristics:

1. From their arrival, the trainees would be encouraged to participate actively in the planning of their program. In fact, in a sense, there would be no program unless they planned it by determining what kind of training program was needed in order to reach the objectives they had formulated.

2. Formal classroom lectures would be played down; small-group interaction would be played up, as would informal interaction of all kinds.

3. Except for Spanish (four hours a day) and weekly evaluation sessions (to be discussed later), attendance at the "happenings" of the program would not be compulsory.

4. An effort would be made to do away with component labels and thus to "integrate" the elements of the program.

5. The program would be "experience-based." There would be ample opportunities furnished for "doing things," such as organizing and operating co-ops, raising chickens and pigs, planting and tending gardens, approaching "academic" subjects through research projects, and so on. Trainees with needed skills would be urged to teach them to others, formally or informally. The emphasis, in short, was to be on trainee activity, not passivity.

6. Emphasis would be placed throughout on awareness of the environment of the training program: of what was going on and how the trainees were reacting to it (and to one another). This was to be achieved through weekly small-group "evaluation sessions." The personnel of these core groups, including the leaders, would remain fairly constant throughout the program.

The actual program did not turn out so neatly as its blue-print, of course. Some trainees took to this kind of design; some did not. Several staff members demonstrated anxieties under the inevitable pressures of the program. Although there were many pressures to revert to the standard model, somehow this never happened. Trainee morale was extraordinarily high; the trainees did in large measure take responsibility for their own training, and especially for defining the goals of training.

Notable Elements of Successful Experienced-Based Training

Four major elements seem to us to have combined to make this a unique educational experiment.

Staff Preparation. First was the degree and intensity of planning that occurred before the trainees arrived. The kind of design we advocate here cannot be conducted by an unprepared staff or by a staff that has not confronted, grappled with, and in some measure dealt beforehand with most of the issues such training raises. When using traditional classroom models, one can assume that the other educators are using roughly similar designs. Much more communication among the training staff is needed to develop commitment to a new model, to test whether proposed training designs do in fact exemplify the model, and to resolve inconsistencies among different parts of the program.

It is not necessary to build a seamless united front in the planning phase; but in a program designed to shift the orientation of the trainees away from a dependence on authority to reliance on their own abilities to diagnose, gather data, and develop independent solutions, it is important that all the learning activities work toward this meta-goal. While there is room for the application of a number of personal teaching styles among staff members in such a program, it is important that there be basic consensus on the importance of giving trainees as much responsibility as they can manage, on the desirability of trainee activity-initiation as opposed to passivity-receptivity in all learning settings, and on the responsibility of staff members continually to help trainees build connections and bridges between their training experiences and the situations for which they are preparing in the field.

It is easy to provide trainees with experiences and problems to solve. It is more difficult to think through the learning and adaptation processes that must take place in these experiences, to help trainees devise ways of collecting data on them, and to aid trainees in conceptualizing the processes so that they may be applied in overseas situations which on the surface may seem to be radically different from the projects assigned during training. This form of elaboration requires the trainee to take account of the training experience, to dig into it rather than float on its surface, to formulate hypotheses and questions. Without such elaboration, experiences are not converted into learning. Trainees should receive assistance in conceptualizing and generalizing their experience. It is impossible to reproduce or simulate or even to know precisely what conditions will be faced by trainees in an overseas situation. Crude simulations may be the best available. The processes of diagnosing and taking action on a problem are similar in the training and application situations, but the content of the problems is different. Unless the trainee has help in abstracting the process from the particular events he experiences, he will face difficulty in translating what he has learned into usable form.

He will not receive this help from staff members who have not been deeply involved in planning the program and who do not manifest the commitment that can result only from involvement. Involvement of this depth and intensity cannot be developed in a traditional administrative situation. The teacher must write his own job description, through interaction with his colleagues. The planning phase must constitute a training phase for the staff.

It is important, too, that much of the planning bear on process issues--that is, the interpersonal and behavioral patterns that can be expected to develop in the course of training. There is a very real sense in which the planning phase can be a kind of mockup of the training program that is to come, with the staff members experiencing similar conflict and anxieties which they must work through before they are ready for the innumerable interpersonal transactions that will make up the actual training program. In planning for this program much of the focus of the work of the work of the consultant was on staff process issues and their relevance to training. By the time the participants arrived, staff members could empathize with the confusion, hostility, and anxiety which this program would create for the trainees simply because the staff had experienced and examined similar feelings as they sought to relinquish the security of traditional classroom models and plan a venture into the ambiguous and unstable world of experience-based training.

Since small-group activities were a critical design characteristic in this model, the staff needed well-developed skills in managing group discussions. The need for skill was especially acute where trainees were being asked to reflect on their own performance and experiences in the more stressful parts of the program. Trainees understandably resisted connecting their behavior in the training situation with how they were likely to function in the overseas situation. When trainees sought to withdraw from the ambiguity and stress of being responsible for their own learning they had to be confronted with this avoidance pattern. All of these problems in learning require sensitivity, skill, and compassion on the part of the staff. The consultant spent considerable time with the staff working on these skills of discussion leadership. This involved both theory and practice during the planning phase and observation and consultation with individual staff members after the program was under way.

Use of Authority. The nontraditional use of authority was of first importance in this program. First, a studied effort was made throughout the program and in the basic design to wean the trainees (and the staff) away from a traditional reliance on authority arbitrarily and especially not to use it in defining the goals of the training program for the trainees, or in playing any kind of role in loco parentis. The trainees were treated like responsible people capable of making their own decisions about the vital issues of training. Throughout the training program, the staff attempted to "level" with the trainees, to keep them informed, and to avoid manipulation of trainee behavior by explicit or implied reference to the threat of deselection. As a result, the trainees tended to trust the staff, despite occasional difficulties.

The earliest manifestation of the nontraditional use of authority in the program came with the orientation, which was a prelude to the subsequent activities of the program. The trainees arrived in Puerto Rico with expectations of receiving more or less traditional classroom training, with perhaps a dash of exposure to Puerto Rican life thrown in for seasoning. The orientation was the first opportunity to break this set and to begin the staff-trainee dialogue which would, hopefully, lead to new attitudes and assumptions about the learning process. The trainees were told (although they did not fully understand at the outset) how the staff would and would not use its authority; what kinds of information, direction, and help the staff would provide; and against what criteria their performance would be evaluated.

The staff made it clear that the trainees were responsible not only for the maintenance of the training camp but also for the organization of their own governing bodies, the parceling out of work, disciplinary action against slackers, and for the formulation of camp rules and regulations. The freedom to create social structures was so different from the attitudes of college administrators (most of these trainees were just a few weeks out of college) that it set them back on their heels.

They were further shocked to learn that the training program was unplanned, at least in the conventional sense, and that attendance at most activities was not compulsory. Instead, they were given written information about the countries and work situations into which they would go in some four months and were asked to meet in small groups with staff members to discuss what kind of training experience this information implied would be useful.

Thus the orientation began to build a conceptual framework for the training. It illustrated how authority would be applied in the program and it began activities in support of this framework. In a design of this sort, authority is not absent. It is used differently and with lesser intensity than is customary, but it is used. It must be. Trainees must know that there are people around who know what they are doing. Many of them need support in beginning to use their own resources for learning. They are well adapted, most of them, to the passive-receptive learning role. They do not abandon it easily. Why should they, when it has worked for them in the past? They profit from authoritative encouragement, even when authority is used to prescribe the use of resources rather than to assure continued dependence.

As it happened, in the Puerto Rico programs there were wide variations in the ability of the staff to work with trainees in helping them to get the most out of their experiences. Those who were least committed to the experience-based model vacillated between excessive and inadequate control over trainee activities. On the one hand, they were concerned lest the trainees "get out of hand" and the staff lose control over the community. On the other, they tended to see the alternative to rigid control as being no staff influence at all over trainees. It seemed to be particularly difficult for them to conceptualize and practice the supportive authority discussed above, possibly because they had never been on the receiving end of it. This was a continuing concern throughout the training and was the subject of much discussion among both trainees and staff. It was also another major focus of the consultant's work with the staff.

Emphasis on Process. The third distinctive element in the program was the emphasis placed on process issues and on developing awareness of the total emotional, interpersonal, and organizational environment in which trainees and staff were living and working.

Throughout the training period trainees were urged to consider the camp and the training program as a community--to be charted, researched, understood, and if need be, changed. In the weekly evaluation sessions trainees were urged to review the organizational climate of the program, their relations with one another, and to comment on such phenomena as the power structure in the Training Center and the formation of trainee subgroups. The first group of trainees to arrive at the Center was encouraged to consider and deal with its feelings of inter-group competition arising from arrival of a second group a week later, and vice versa. When crises occurred, those affected by them were urged to analyze what had really happened and why the principals had acted as they did.

The "Project" Approach. The training program consisted of large and small problem-solving projects, planned for the most part by the trainees themselves, who related to the staff through a complex of formal and informal interpersonal and intergroup transactions. The term "project" is used here to describe an activity requiring a learner to:

1. Obtain information from the social environment (communication);

2. Formulate and test hypotheses about forces and processes present in the environment (diagnosis);

3. Select and describe some part of the situation which is to be changed or altered (problem definition);

4. Plan action to solve the problem (commitment, risk taking);

5. Carry out the action, enlisting the help and cooperation of others (influencing and organizing);

6. Verbalize attitudes, perceptions, and tentative learnings from the experience (cognition and generalization).

Projects should be the heart of an experience-based training program. They may take almost any form: they may be short or long; they may overlap with other training activities; they may involve activity inside or outside the training location.

In the programs described here, trainees established cooperatives, they planted gardens and raised chickens and pigs, and they organized mutual teaching-learning activities for the sharing of specialized skills such as accounting, welding, and arts and crafts. They participated in such staff-designed projects as climbing rocks, trekking, survival experiences, construction tasks, and field training in Puerto Rican villages.

The emphasis on trainee-developed projects reinforced the staff's initial message regarding autonomy, responsibility, and initiative. The more aggressive trainees responded eagerly to the message; the less independent trainees tended to substitute the leadership of other trainees for the authority they found missing in the staff. Often, not being required to do anything specific, they did nothing. Some trainees were capable of accepting autonomy with regard to both the ends of a project and the means; the less creative, the less able, the less independent, the less trusting required the specification of ends before they could proceed to devise the means of getting there. In no case, however, were both the ends and the means specified. Tasks were designed to require trainees to diagnose a situation, develop a variety of possible approaches and select one, and to take initiative to produce the end result desired.

In the training-center-as-a-community project trainees set goals as homely as influencing the dining room to serve a wider variety of food and bringing other trainees to a

higher level of sanitation and neatness in their living quarters. A principal activity was the trainees' persistent efforts to influence the staff to provide learning resources in the form of reading, lectures, and discussions. This hunger for learning was in sharp contrast to the avoidance games many of the trainees had shared with their college classmates only a few weeks earlier.

The critical factor in a project-focused program is the manner in which staff members support and assist the trainees in elaborating their projects. At one extreme, a project may be presented to a group of trainees to solve as best they can, with the learning falling where it may. No special effort is made to organize comparisons between experiences, to examine value issues or conflicts, or to encourage conceptualization of the influence styles and interaction patterns used by different individuals in planning and executing the action.

At the other extreme, an effort may be made to force learning from each part of the experience. Trainees may be convened in small groups and urged to formulate the problems of diagnosis, conflict, influence, and organization implicit in their project. Staff members participate in work and planning sessions as process consultants whose role is to help participants to observe and become aware of the social forces with which they are dealing in the here-and-now.

It is the elaboration of an experience-based training design which requires a high order of staff skills. It is much easier to provide trainees with problems to solve than it is to think through the social and individual processes which will be going on, devise means of bringing them to light, and aid trainees in conceptualizing the experience so that their learning may be applied in later overseas situations which are on the surface quite different. It is here that the discussion leadership skills of the staff become critical, for they must be used to draw out of the trainee the principles and generalizations which are latent in the experience. If this does not occur, much of the potential learning will be lost.

Most of the staff worked hard at performing this function, although they found it among the most difficult of the responsibilities they had accepted in designing an experience-based program. Many of the trainees were adept at avoiding examination of the implications of this experience, particularly when the experience was stressful and anxiety-provoking. The staff were understandably reluctant to push such confrontation. Considerable learning was undoubtedly lost through caution and lack of skill, but during the course of the program the staff's effectiveness as inductive teachers increased steadily with practice.

Field Training. The trainees in this program spent a total of almost a month in small Puerto Rican villages where they faced problems of adaptation similar to those they would confront in Latin America. Here, too, efforts were made to assist the trainees in designing projects around their field living and to convert them into real learning afterward.

Puerto Rico, of course, offers an almost ideal transitional environment for trainees bound for Latin America. But if adequate help in conceptualizing and generalizing is available, almost any alien situation can become a meaningful field training assignment in preparation for cross-cultural work. For urban dwellers, rural living may be alien; for members of the middle class, experience with the poor, angry, and the disadvantaged provides real confrontation. It is desirable to conduct field training in a culture similar to that for which a trainee is being prepared, but this is by no means essential. The important thing is to create as much "cultural distance" as possible from the life the trainee has been living, so that the values and attitudes that have worked for him before are no longer adequate. The cultural content may differ from that of the area for which the trainee is bound, but the process problems that grow out of confrontation are similar.

Integration of Content and Process. A persistent problem was how to make fact, theory, and opinion about the cultures to which the trainees were going and the jobs they were to do relevant to the problem-solving environment of the training program. On the one hand, lectures and books seemed to provide an escape from involvement and confrontation for those trainees who needed to defend themselves against the personal exposure of the program. On the other hand, for those trainees who did become heavily involved, the lectures and readings often seemed dry, abstract, and unreal. Trainees were given responsibility for organizing the use of visiting lecturers, which may have increased their feeling of responsibility, but it did little to connect the content to problem-solving processes.

Martin Tarcher (1966) has recently described a feasible approach to the integration of content and process. In a program for community leaders, he created project teams as the central learning units. The teams were responsible for using data from an exhaustive community survey to diagnose and plan action for development of the community. Outside lecturers were asked to familiarize themselves with the same data and to introduce only material directly relevant to the solution of the problems revealed in the data. Thus, content input was directly tied to the problem-solving process. There is strong reason to believe that only content which can be used and practiced in the training situation is usefully learned in an experience-based training program. Tarcher's design meets this criterion.

Behind the Design: The Teacher. Even those who are attracted to the approaches to learning we have described here may well ask where the teachers will come from to carry them out. Clearly, the desired skill mix is sharply divergent from the blend of intellectual competence and verbal facility found in good classroom teachers.

The teacher in an experience-based program is involved with people, not books; with real situations, not abstractions. He must collaborate closely with his colleagues. In his work with students, he will do little presenting and much listening. Instead of organizing content material, he will seek patterns, principles, and generalizations in the reactions of trainees. Subject matter competence is useful, of course, but it will not get the job done without true competence in the facilitation of learning through focus on process. The traditional systems in which most of us were formed do not value the subtle and sophisticated teaching skills described here.

There are, however, incompletely exploited sources of the competence which is needed. Industry, government, and the military all have had to develop methods of education that will pay off in immediately transferable skills. Educational innovation and change have been much more rapid in these applied settings than in colleges and universities. Industrial trainers in particular must be open to innovation and experimentation, or they do not survive.

For the overseas agencies, such as the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development, a ready source of potential educators exists in those returning from the field. The Peace Corps program discussed here was conducted largely by former Volunteers, few of whom had previous teaching experience. As our strictures about staff planning and preparation imply, though, it cannot be assumed that persons with practical experience are necessarily qualified to teach and communicate it. This is a particularly unjustified assumption when the proposed training is highly inductive. The "practical man" has at his disposal a fund of "war stories" which purport to illustrate how to handle various concrete and specific situations abroad. But concrete and often-undigested experiences such as these are of limited value. The "practical" man, if he is to become an effective trainer, must learn to conceptualize the cross-cultural learning experience in terms applicable to experience-based learning. For example, if a practical community developer can come to see working with trainees as "another kind of community development," then he is well on his way to translating his cross-cultural experience into training design. He will have begun to understand the learning process in which he participated overseas and to consider how such experiences might be simulated for trainees in process, if not in content.

Many cross-cultural workers, however, are so practical and concrete in their thinking that they learn only those aspects of a culture which they directly encounter. They find it difficult to generalize beyond their own experiences. They may have learned, but they have not learned how they learned.

Then there are those who have taken part in cross-cultural experiences, who have learned how to learn, and who can, with further training, build experiences which will transmit what they know to others. To do this requires a clear understanding of such principles of learning as those described in this paper. The conceptual framework for experience-based training is not implicit in our educational background. We operate comfortably within a traditional learning system both as pupils or teachers, but this does not mean that we understand the conditions which facilitate learning and the transfer of learning to an application situation.

When, therefore, an individual is asked to participate in the design and conduct of training radically different in form from traditional models, he needs a basic education himself in the teaching and learning process. He needs supervised and assisted experience in designing training, conducting it, and evaluating the results. He needs to work with others who are also struggling with the tasks of putting together and operating experience-based training designs.

The Climate for Innovation

The plans proposed in this paper have no fail-safe ingredients to protect them from failure. The launching of educational innovation requires more than a blueprint for success.

Fortunately, there are some resources and forces toward innovation of the kind we have proposed. Our culture is highly pragmatic. Americans are receptive to ideas that work. Supporting this pragmatism are the experiences of those who have lived in the cross-cultural situation, who have been open to their experience, and who have been able to generalize from it.

In addition, there is a small body of experience-based pedagogy which provides crude models of what this training may look like and accomplish. Practitioners of sensitivity training have been using experience-based pedagogy for some time. There are experimental schools, and even a college here and there, and a growing number of "practical" training settings where efforts are being made to develop and refine experience-based education. The models are available, but they must be refined and adapted to the purposes at hand.

Lastly, the climate for educational innovation has never been better than it is now. For the first time in recent years students (and some of their professors) in institutions of higher education are beginning to question the goals and procedures of their education. There is a hunger for educational experiences which involve the whole person, which get to the "heart of the matter," which seem to have a more direct connection with life as it is lived in our relativist, kinetic, peripatetic, crisis-ridden society. Perhaps this questioning is the prelude to changes in our diverse but tradition-bound institutions of higher learning. In the hope of influencing that change this paper has been written. For we cannot escape the conclusion that the design principles we have enunciated here might have validity in preparing people for the ambiguities of life at home, as well as for life abroad.

References

Schein, E., & Bennis, W. Personal and organizational growth through the laboratory method. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Tarcher, M. Leadership and the power of ideas. New York: Harper, 1966.

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION:

A GUIDE TO MEN OF ACTION*

Edward T. Hall and William Foote Whyte

How can anthropological knowledge help the man of action in dealing with people of another culture? We shall seek to answer that question by examining the process of intercultural communication.

Anthropologists have long claimed that a knowledge of culture is valuable to the administrator. More and more people in business and government are willing to take this claim seriously, but they ask that we put culture to them in terms they can understand and act upon.

When the layman thinks of culture, he is likely to think in terms of (1) the way people dress, (2) the beliefs they hold, and (3) the customs they practice--with an accent upon the esoteric. Without undertaking any comprehensive definition, we can concede that all three are aspects of culture, and yet point out that they do not get us very far, either theoretically or practically.

Dress is misleading, if we assume that differences in dress indicate differences in belief and behavior. If that were the case, then we should expect to find people dressed like ourselves to be thinking and acting like ourselves. While there are still peoples wearing "colorful" apparel quite different from ours, we find in many industrializing societies that the people with whom we deal dress much as we do--and yet think and act quite differently.

Knowledge of beliefs may leave us up in the air because the connections between beliefs and behavior are seldom obvious. In the case of religious beliefs, we may know, for example, that the Mohammedan must pray to Allah a certain number of times a day and that therefore the working day must provide for praying time. This is important, to be sure, but the point is so obvious that it is unlikely to be overlooked by anyone. The administrator must also grasp the less dramatic aspects of everyday behavior, and here a knowledge of beliefs is a very imperfect guide.

Customs provide more guidance, providing we do not limit ourselves to the esoteric and also search for the pattern of behavior into which a given custom fits. The anthropologist, in dealing with customary behavior, is not content with identifying individual items. To him, these items are not miscellaneous. They have meaning only as they are fitted together into a pattern.

But even assuming that the pattern can be communicated to the administrator, there is still something important lacking. The pattern shows how the people act--when among themselves. The administrator is not directly concerned with that situation. Whatever background information he has, he needs to interpret to himself how the people act <u>in relation to himself</u>. He is dealing with a cross-cultural situation. The link is between the administrator, representing one culture, and people representing another. If communication is effective, then understanding grows with collaborative action. If communication is faulty, then no book knowledge of culture can assure effective action.

---

*Article published in Human Organization, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1960, pp. 5-12. Reprinted by permission of authors and publisher.

This is not to devalue the knowledge of culture that can be provided by the anthropologist. It is only to suggest that the point of implementation of the knowledge must be in the communication process. Let us therefore examine the process of intercultural communication. By so doing we can accomplish two things: (A) Broaden knowledge of ourselves by revealing some of our own unconscious communicative acts. (B) Clear away heretofore almost insurmountable obstacles to understanding in the cross-cultural process. We also learn that communication, as it is used here, goes far beyond words and includes many other acts upon which judgments are based of what is transpiring and from which we draw conclusions as to what has occurred in the past.

Culture affects communication in various ways. It determines the time and timing of interpersonal events, the places where it is appropriate to discuss particular topics, the physical distance separating one speaker from another, the tone of voice that is appropriate to the subject matter. Culture, in this sense, delineates the amount and type of physical contact, if any, which convention permits or demands, and the intensity of emotion which goes with it. Culture includes the relationship of what is said to what is meant--as when "no" means "maybe" and "tomorrow" means "never." Culture, too, determines whether a given matter--say, a business contract--should be initially discussed between two persons or hacked out in a day-long conference which includes four or five senior officials from each side, with perhaps an assist from the little man who brings in the coffee.

These are important matters which the businessman who hopes to trade abroad ignores at his peril. They are also elusive, for every man takes his own culture for granted. Even a well-informed national of another country is hard put to explain why, in his own land, the custom is thus-and-so rather than so-and-thus; as hard put, indeed, as you would probably be if asked what is the "rule" which governs the precise time in a relationship that you begin using another man's first name. One "just knows." In other words, you do not know and cannot explain satisfactorily because you learn this sort of thing unconsciously in your upbringing, in your culture, and you take such knowledge for granted. Yet the impact of culture on communication can be observed and the lessons taught.

Since the most obvious form of communication is by language, we will first consider words, meanings, voice tones, emotions, and physical contact; then take up, in turn, the cultural impact of time, place, and social class relations on business situations in various lands. Finally, we will suggest what the individual administrator may do to increase his effectiveness abroad, and what students of culture may do to advance this application of anthropology.

Beyond Language

Americans are often accused of not being very good at language, or at least not very much interested in learning foreign languages. There is little evidence that any people are inherently "better" at languages than any other, given the opportunity and incentive to learn. The West and Central European who has since childhood been in daily contact with two or three languages learns to speak them all, and frequently to read and write them as well. Under similar conditions, American children do the same. Indeed, a not uncommon sight on the backroads of Western Europe is a mute, red-faced American military family lost on a Sunday drive while the youngest child, barely able to lisp his own English, leans from the window to interpret the directions of some gnarled farmer whose dialect is largely unintelligible to most of his own countrymen.

We should not underestimate the damage our lack of language facility as a nation has done to our relations all over the world. Obviously, if you cannot speak a man's language, you are terribly handicapped in communicating with him.

But languages can be learned and yet most, if not all, of the disabling errors described in this article could still be made. Vocabulary, grammar, even verbal facility are not enough. Unless a man understands the subtle cues that are implicit in language,

tone, gestures and expression, he will not only consistently misinterpret what is said to him, but he may offend irretrievably without knowing how or why.

Do They Mean What They Say?

Can't you believe what a man says? We all recognize that the basic honesty of the speaker is involved. What we often fail to recognize, however, is that the question involves cultural influences that have nothing to do with the honesty or dependability of the individual.

In the United States we put a premium on direct expression. The "good" American is supposed to say what he means and to mean what he says. If, on important matters, we discover that someone spoke deviously or evasively, we would be inclined to regard him thereafter as unreliable if not out-and-out dishonest.

In some other cultures, the words and their meanings do not have such a direct connection. People may be more concerned with the emotional context of the situation than with the meaning of particular words. This leads them to give an agreeable and pleasant answer to a question when a literal, factual answer might be unpleasant or embarrassing.

This situation is not unknown in our culture, of course. How many times have you muttered your delighted appreciation for a boring evening? We term this simple politeness and understand each other perfectly.

On the other hand, analogous "polite" behavior on a matter of factory production would be incomprehensible. An American businessman would be most unlikely to question another businessman's word if he were technically qualified and said that his plant could produce 1000 gross of widgets a month. We are "taught" that it is none of our business to inquire too deeply into the details of his production system. This would be prying and might be considered an attempt to steal his operational plans.

Yet this cultural pattern has trapped many an American into believing that when a Japanese manufacturer answered a direct question with the reply that he could produce 1000 gross of widgets, he meant what he said. If the American had been escorted through the factory and saw quite clearly that its capacity was, at the most, perhaps 500 gross of widgets per month, he would be likely to say to himself:

> Well, this fellow probably has a brother-in-law who has a factory who can make up the difference. He isn't telling the whole story because he's afraid I might try to make a better deal with the brother-in-law. Besides, what business is it of mine, so long as he meets the schedule?

The cables begin to burn after the American returns home and only 500 gross of widgets arrive each month.

What the American did not know was that in Japanese culture one avoids the direct question unless the questioner is absolutely certain that the answer will not embarrass the Japanese businessman in any way whatsoever. In Japan for one to admit being unable to perform a given operation or measure up to a given standard means a bitter loss of face. Given a foreigner who is so stupid, ignorant, or insensitive as to ask an embarrassing question, the Japanese is likely to choose what appears to him the lesser of two evils.

Americans caught in this cross-cultural communications trap are apt to feel doubly deceived because the Japanese manufacturer may well be an established and respected member of the business community.

Excitable People?

Man communicates not by words alone. His tone of voice, his facial expressions, his gestures all contribute to the infinitely varied calculus of meaning. But the confusion of tongues is more than matched by the confusion of gesture and other culture cues. One

man's nod is another man's negative. Each culture has its own rich array of meaningful signs, symbols, gestures, emotional connotations, historical references, traditional responses and--equally significant--pointed silences. These have been built up over the millennia as (who can say?) snarls, growls, and love murmurs gathered meaning and dignity with long use, to end up perhaps as the worn coinage of trite expression.

Consider the Anglo-Saxon tradition of preserving one's calm. The American is taught by his culture to suppress his feelings. He is conditioned to regard emotion as generally bad (except in weak women who can't help themselves) and a stern self-control as good. The more important a matter, the more solemn and outwardly dispassionate he is likely to be. A cool head, granite visage, dispassionate logic--it is no accident that the Western story hero consistently displays these characteristics.

In the Middle East it is otherwise. From childhood, the Arab is permitted, even encouraged, to express his feelings without inhibition. Grown men can weep, shout, gesture expressively and violently, jump up and down--and be admired as sincere.

The modulated, controlled Anglo-Saxon is likely to be regarded with suspicion--he must be hiding something, practicing to deceive.

The exuberant and emotional Arab is likely to disturb the Anglo-Saxon, cause him to writhe inwardly with embarrassment--for isn't this childish behavior? And aren't things getting rather out of hand?

Then, again, there is the matter of how loudly one should talk.

In the Arab world, in discussions among equals, the men attain a decibel level that would be considered aggressive, objectionable, and obnoxious in the United States. Loudness connotes strength and sincerity among Arabs; a soft tone implies weakness, deviousness. This is so "right" in the Arab culture that several Arabs have told us they discounted anything heard over the "Voice of America" because the signal was so weak!

Personal status modulates voice tone, however, even in Arab society. The Saudi Arab shows respect to his superior--to a sheik, say--by lowering his voice and mumbling. The affluent American may also be addressed in this fashion, making almost impossible an already difficult situation. Since in the American culture one unconsciously "asks" another to raise his voice by raising one's own, the American speaks louder. This lowers the Arab's tone more and increases the mumble. This triggers a shouting response in the American--which cues the Arab into a frightened "I'm not being respectful enough" tone well below audibility.

They are not likely to part with much respect for each other.

To Touch or Not to Touch?

How much physical contact should appropriately accompany social or business conversation?

In the United States we discourage physical contact, particularly between adult males. The most common physical contact is the handshake and, compared to Europeans, we use it sparingly.

The handshake is the most detached and impersonal form of greeting or farewell in Latin America. Somewhat more friendly is the left hand placed on another man's shoulder during a handshake. Definitely more intimate and warm is the "doble abrazo" in which two men embrace by placing their arms around each other's shoulders.

These are not difficult conventions to live with, particularly since the North American can easily permit the Latin American to take the initiative in any form of contact more intimate than the handshake. Far more difficult for the North American to learn to live with comfortably are the less stylized forms of physical contact such as the hand on one's arm during conversation. To the North American this is edging toward what in his

culture is an uncomfortable something--possible sexual--which inhibits his own communication.

Yet there are cultures which restrict physical contact far more than we do. An American at a cocktail party in Java tripped over the invisible cultural ropes which mark the boundaries of acceptable behavior. He was seeking to develop a business relationship with a prominent Javanese and seemed to be doing very well. Yet, when the cocktail party ended, so apparently did a promising beginning. For the North American spent nearly six months trying to arrange a second meeting. He finally learned, through pitying intermediaries, that at the cocktail party he had momentarily placed his arm on the shoulder of the Javanese--and in the presence of other people. Humiliating! Almost unpardonable in traditional Javanese etiquette.

In this particular case, the unwitting breach was mended by a graceful apology. It is worth noting, however, that a truly cordial business relationship never did develop.

The Five Dimensions of Time

If we peel away a few layers of cultural clothing, we begin to reach almost totally unconscious reactions. Our ideas of time, for example, are deeply instilled in us when we are children. If they are contradicted by another's behavior, we react with anger, not knowing exactly why. For the businessman, five important temporal concepts are: appointment time, discussion time, acquaintance time, visiting time, and time schedules.

Anyone who has travelled abroad or dealt at all extensively with non-Americans learns that punctuality is variously interpreted. It is one thing to recognize this with the mind; to adjust to a different kind of <u>appointment time</u> is quite another.

In Latin America, you should expect to spend hours waiting in outer offices. If you bring your American interpretation of what constitutes punctuality to a Latin-American office, you will fray your temper and elevate your blood pressure. For a forty-five-minute wait is not unusual--no more unusual than a five-minute wait would be in the United States. No insult is intended, no arbitrary pecking order is being established. If, in the United States, you would not be outraged by a five-minute wait, you should not be outraged by the Latin-American's forty-five-minute delay in seeing you. The time pie is differently cut, that's all.

Further, the Latin American doesn't usually schedule individual appointments to the exclusion of other appointments. The informal clock of his upbringing ticks more slowly and he rather enjoys seeing several people on different matters at the same time. The three-ring circus atmosphere which results, if interpreted in the American's scale of time and propriety, seems to signal him to go away, to tell him that he is not being properly treated, to indicate that his dignity is under attack. Not so. The clock on the wall may look the same but it tells a different sort of time.

The cultural error may be compounded by a further miscalculation. In the United States, a consistently tardy man is likely to be considered undependable, and by our cultural clock this is a reasonable conclusion. For you to judge a Latin American by your scale of time values is to risk a major error.

Suppose you have waited forty-five minutes and there is a man in his office, by some miracle alone in the room with you. Do you now get down to business and stop "wasting time"?

If you are not forewarned by experience or a friendly advisor, you may try to do this. And it would usually be a mistake. For, in the American culture, <u>discussion</u> is a means to an end: the deal. You try to make your point quickly, efficiently, neatly. If your purpose is to arrange some major affairs, your instinct is probably to settle the major issues first, leave the details for later, possibly for the technical people to work out.

For the Latin American, the discussion is a part of the spice of life. Just as he tends not to be overly concerned about reserving you your specific segment of time, he tends not as rigidly to separate business from non-business. He runs it all together and wants to make something of a social event out of what you, in your culture, regard as strictly business.

The Latin American is not alone in this. The Greek businessman, partly for the same and partly for different reasons, does not lean toward the "hit-and-run" school of business behavior, either. The Greek businessman adds to the social element, however, a feeling about what length of discussion time constitutes good faith. In America, we show good faith by ignoring the details. "Let's agree on the main points. The details will take care of themselves."

Not so the Greek. He signifies good will and good faith by what may seem to you an interminable discussion which includes every conceivable detail. Otherwise, you see, he cannot help but feel that the other man might be trying to pull the wool over his eyes. Our habit, in what we feel to be our relaxed and friendly way, of postponing details until later smacks the Greek between the eyes as a maneuver to flank him. Even if you can somehow convince him that this is not the case, the meeting must still go on a certain indefinite--but, by our standards, long--time or he will feel disquieted.

The American desire to get down to business and on with other things works to our disadvantage in other parts of the world, too; and not only in business. The head of a large, successful Japanese firm commented: "You Americans have a terrible weakness. We Japanese know about it and exploit it every chance we get. You are impatient. We have learned that if we just make you wait long enough, you'll agree to anything."

Whether this is literally true or not, the Japanese executive singled out a trait of American culture which most of us share and which, one may assume from the newspapers, the Russians have not overlooked, either.

By <u>acquaintance time</u> we mean how long you must know a man before you are willing to do business with him.

In the United States, if we know that a salesman represents a well-known, reputable company, and if we need his product, he may walk away from the first meeting with an order in his pocket. A few minutes conversation to decide matters of price, delivery, payment, model of product--nothing more is involved. In Central America, local custom does not permit a salesman to land in town, call on the customer and walk away with an order, no matter how badly your prospect wants and needs your product. It is traditional there that you must see your man at least three times before you can discuss the nature of your business.

Does this mean that the South American businessman does not recognize the merits of one product over another? Of course it doesn't. It is just that the weight of tradition presses him to do business within a circle of friends. If a product he needs is not available within his circle, he does not go outside it so much as he enlarges the circle itself to include a new friend who can supply the want. Apart from his cultural need to "feel right" about a new relationship, there is the logic of his business system. One of the realities of his life is that it is dangerous to enter into business with someone over whom you have no more than formal legal "control." In the past decades, his legal system has not always been as firm as ours and he has learned through experience that he needs the sanctions implicit in the informal system of friendship.

<u>Visiting time</u> involves the question of who sets the time for a visit. George Coelho, a social psychologist from India, gives an illustrative case. A U. S. businessman received this invitation from an Indian businessman: "Won't you and your family come and see us? Come anytime." Several weeks later, the Indian repeated the invitation in the same words. Each time the American replied that he would certainly like to drop in--but he never did. The reason is obvious in terms of our culture. Here "come any time" is just an expression of friendliness. You are not really expected to show up unless your

host proposes a specific time. In India, on the contrary, the words are meant literally--that the host is putting himself at the disposal of his guest and really expects him to come. It is the essence of politeness to leave it to the guest to set a time at his convenience. If the guest never comes, the Indian naturally assumes that he does not want to come. Such a misunderstanding can lead to a serious rift between men who are trying to do business with each other.

Time schedules present Americans with another problem in many parts of the world. Without schedules, deadlines, priorities, and timetables, we tend to feel that our country could not run at all. Not only are they essential to getting work done, but they also play an important role in the informal communication process. Deadlines indicate priorities and priorities signal the relative importance of people and the processes they control. These are all so much a part of our lives that a day hardly passes without some reference to them. "I have to be there by 6:30." "If I don't have these plans out by 5:00 they'll be useless." "I told J.B. I'd be finished by noon tomorrow and now he tells me to drop everything and get hot on the McDermott account. What do I do now?"

In our system, there are severe penalties for not completing work on time and important rewards for holding to schedules. One's integrity and reputation are at stake.

You can imagine the fundamental conflicts that arise when we attempt to do business with people who are just as strongly oriented away from time schedules as we are toward them.

The Middle Eastern peoples are a case in point. Not only is our idea of time schedules no part of Arab life but the mere mention of a deadline to an Arab is like waving a red flag in front of a bull. In his culture, your emphasis on a deadline has the emotional effect on him that his backing you into a corner and threatening you with a club would have on you.

One effect of this conflict of unconscious habit patterns is that hundreds of American-owned radio sets are lying on the shelves of Arab radio repair shops, untouched. The Americans made the serious cross-cultural error of asking to have the repair completed by a certain time.

How do you cope with this? How does the Arab get another Arab to do anything? Every culture has its own ways of bringing pressure to get results. The usual Arab way is one which Americans avoid as "bad manners." It is needling.

An Arab businessman whose car broke down explained it this way:

> First, I go to the garage and tell the mechanic what is wrong with my car. I wouldn't want to give him the idea that I didn't know. After that, I leave the car and walk around the block. When I come back to the garage, I ask him if he has started to work yet. On my way home from lunch I stop in and ask him how things are going. When I go back to the office I stop by again. In the evening, I return and peer over his shoulder for a while. If I didn't keep this up, he'd be off working on someone else's car.

If you haven't been needled by an Arab, you just haven't been needled.

A Place for Everything

We say that there is a time and place for everything, but compared to other countries and cultures we give very little emphasis to place distinctions. Business is almost a universal value with us; it can be discussed almost anywhere, except perhaps in church. One can even talk business on the church steps going to and from the service. Politics is only slightly more restricted in the places appropriate for its discussion.

In other parts of the world, there are decided place restrictions on the discussion of business and politics. The American who is not conscious of the unwritten laws will offend if he abides by his own rather than by the local rules.

In India, you should not talk business when visiting a man's home. If you do, you prejudice your chances of ever working out a satisfactory business relationship.

In Latin America, although university students take an active interest in politics, tradition decrees that a politician should avoid political subjects when speaking on university grounds. A Latin American politician commented to anthropologist Allan Holmberg that neither he nor his fellow politicians would have dared attempt a political speech on the grounds of the University of San Marcos in Peru--as did Vice-President Nixon.

To complicate matters further, the student body of San Marcos, anticipating the visit, had voted that Mr. Nixon would not be welcome. The University Rector had issued no invitation, presumably because he expected what did, in fact, happen.

As a final touch, Mr. Nixon's interpreter was a man in full military uniform. In Latin American countries, some of which had recently overthrown military dictators, the symbolism of the military uniform could hardly contribute to a cordial atmosphere. Latin Americans need no reminder that the United States is a great military power.

Mr. Nixon's efforts were planned in the best traditions of our own culture: he hoped to improve relations through a direct, frank, and face-to-face discussion with students--the future leaders of their country. Unfortunately, this approach did not fit in at all with the culture of the host country. Of course, elements hostile to the United States did their best to capitalize upon this cross-cultural misunderstanding. However, even Latin Americans friendly to us, while admiring the Vice President's courage, found themselves acutely embarrassed by the behavior of their people and ours in the ensuing difficulties.

Being Comfortable in Space

Like time and place, differing ideas of space hide traps for the uninformed. Without realizing it, almost any person raised in the United States is likely to give an unintended snub to a Latin American simply in the way we handle space relationships, particularly during conversations.

In North America, the "proper" distance to stand when talking to another adult male you do not know well is about two feet, at least in a formal business conversation. (Naturally at a cocktail party, the distance shrinks, but anything under eight to ten inches is likely to provoke an apology or an attempt to back up.)

To a Latin American, with his cultural traditions and habits, a distance of two feet seems to him approximately what five feet would to us. To him, we seem distant and cold. To us, he gives an impression of pushiness.

As soon as a Latin American moves close enough for him to feel comfortable, we feel uncomfortable and edge back. We once observed a conversation between a Latin and a North American which began at one end of a forty-foot hall. At intervals we noticed them again, finally at the other end of the hall. This rather amusing displacement had been accomplished by an almost continual series of small backward steps on the part of the American, trying unconsciously to reach a comfortable talking distance, and an equal closing of the gap by the Latin American as he attempted to reach his accustomed conversation space.

Americans in their offices in Latin America tend to keep their native acquaintances at our distance--not the Latin American's distance--by taking up a position behind a desk or typewriter. The barricade approach to communication is practiced even by old hands in Latin America who are completely unaware of its cultural significance. They know only that they are comfortable without realizing that the distance and equipment unconsciously make the Latin American uncomfortable.

How Class Channels Communication

We would be mistaken to regard the communication patterns which we observe around the world as no more than a miscellaneous collection of customs. The communication pattern of a given society is part of its total culture pattern and can only be understood in that context.

We cannot undertake here to relate many examples of communication behavior to the underlying culture of the country. For the businessman, it might be useful to mention the difficulties in the relationship between social levels and the problem of information feedback from lower to higher levels in industrial organizations abroad.

There is in Latin America a pattern of human relations and union-management relations quite different from that with which we are familiar in the United States. Everett Hagen of MIT has noted the heavier emphasis upon line authority and the lesser development of staff organizations in Latin-American plants when compared with North American counterparts. To a much greater extent than in the United States, the government becomes involved in the handling of all kinds of labor problems.

These differences seem to be clearly related to the culture and social organization of Latin America. We find there that society has been much more rigidly stratified than it has with us. As a corollary, we find a greater emphasis upon authority in family and the community.

This emphasis upon status and class distinction makes it very difficult for people of different status levels to express themselves freely and frankly in discussion and argument. In the past, the pattern has been for the man of lower status to express deference to his superior in any face-to-face contact. This is so even when everyone knows that the subordinate dislikes the superior. The culture of Latin America places a great premium upon keeping personal relations harmonious on the surface.

In the United States, we feel that it is not only desirable but natural to speak up to your superior, to tell the boss exactly what you think, even when you disagree with him. Of course, we do not always do this, but we think that we should, and we feel guilty if we fail to speak our minds frankly. When workers in our factories first get elected to local union office, they may find themselves quite self-conscious about speaking up to the boss and arguing grievances. Many of them, however, quickly learn to do it and enjoy the experience. American culture emphasizes the thrashing-out of differences in face-to-face contacts. It de-emphasizes the importance of status. As a result, we have built institutions for handling industrial disputes on the basis of the local situation, and we rely on direct discussion by the parties immediately involved.

In Latin America, where it is exceedingly difficult for people to express their differences face-to-face and where status differences and authority are much more strongly emphasized than here, the workers tend to look to a third party--the government--to take care of their problems. Though the workers have great difficulty in thrashing out their problems with management, they find no difficulty in telling government representatives their problems. And it is to their government that they look for an authority to settle their grievances with management.

Status and class also decide whether business will be done on an individual or a group basis.

In the United States, we are growing more and more accustomed to working as members of large organizations. Despite this, we still assume that there is no need to send a delegation to do a job that one capable man might well handle.

In some other parts of the world, the individual cannot expect to gain the respect necessary to accomplish this purpose, no matter how capable he is, unless he brings along an appropriate number of associates.

In the United States, we would rarely think it necessary or proper to call on a customer in a group. He might well be antagonized by the hard sell. In Japan--as an example--the importance of the occasion and of the man is measured by whom he takes along.

This practice goes far down in the business and government hierarchies. Even a university professor is likely to bring one or two retainers along on academic business. Otherwise people might think that he was a nobody and that his affairs were of little moment.

Even when a group is involved in the U.S., the head man is the spokesman and sets the tone. This is not always the case in Japan. Two young Japanese once requested an older American widely respected in Tokyo to accompany them so that they could "stand on his face." He was not expected to enter into the negotiation; his function was simply to be present as an indication that their intentions were serious.

Adjustment Goes Both Ways

One need not have devoted his life to a study of various cultures to see that none of them is static. All are constantly changing and one element of change is the very fact that U.S. enterprise enters a foreign field. This is inevitable and may be constructive if we know how to utilize our knowledge. The problem is for us to be aware of our impact and to learn how to induce changes skillfully.

Rather than try to answer the general question of how two cultures interact, we will consider the key problem of personnel selection and development in two particular intercultural situations, both in Latin cultures.

One U.S. company had totally different experiences with "Smith" and "Jones" in the handling of its labor relations. The local union leaders were bitterly hostile to Smith, whereas they could not praise Jones enough. These were puzzling reactions to higher management. Smith seemed a fair-minded and understanding man; it was difficult to fathom how anyone could be bitter against him. At the same time, Jones did not appear to be currying favor by his generosity in giving away the firm's assets. To management, he seemed to be just as firm a negotiator as Smith.

The explanation was found in the two men's communication characteristics. When the union leaders came in to negotiate with Smith, he would let them state their case fully and freely--without interruption, but also without comment. When they had finished, he would say, "I'm sorry. We can't do it." He would follow this blunt statement with a brief and entirely cogent explanation of his reasons for refusal. If the union leaders persisted in their arguments, Smith would paraphrase his first statement, calmly and succinctly. In either case, the discussion was over in a few minutes. The union leaders would storm out of Smith's office complaining bitterly about the cold and heartless man with whom they had to deal.

Jones handled the situation differently. His final conclusion was the same as Smith's--but he would state it only after two or three hours of discussion. Furthermore, Jones participated actively in these discussions, questioning the union leaders for more information, relating the case in question to previous cases, philosophizing about labor relations and human rights and exchanging stories about work experience. When the discussion came to an end, the union leaders would leave the office, commenting on how warmhearted and understanding he was, and how confident they were that he would help them when it was possible for him to do so. They actually seemed more satisfied with a negative decision from Jones than they did with a hard-won concession from Smith.

This was clearly a case where the personality of Jones happened to match certain discernible requirements of the Latin American culture. It was happenstance in this case that Jones worked out and Smith did not, for by American standards both were top-flight men. Since a talent for the kind of negotiation that the Latin American considers graceful and acceptable can hardly be developed in a grown man (or perhaps even in a young one),

the basic problem is one of personnel selection in terms of the culture where the candidate is to work.

The second case is more complicated because it involves much deeper intercultural adjustments. The management of the parent U.S. company concerned had learned--as have the directors of most large firms with good-sized installations overseas--that one cannot afford to have all of the top and middle-management positions manned by North Americans. It is necessary to advance nationals up the overseas-management ladder as rapidly as their abilities permit. So the nationals have to learn not only the technical aspects of their jobs but also how to function at higher levels in the organization.

Latin culture emphasizes authority in the home, church, and community. Within the organization this produces a built-in hesitancy about speaking up to one's superiors. The initiative, the acceptance of responsibility which we value in our organizations had to be stimulated. How could it be done?

We observed one management man who had done a remarkable job of building up these very qualities in his general foremen and foremen. To begin with, he stimulated informal contacts between himself and these men through social events to which the men and their wives came. He saw to it that his senior North American assistants and their wives were also present. Knowing the language, he mixed freely with all. At the plant, he circulated about, dropped in not to inspect or check up, but to joke and to break down the great barrier that existed in the local traditions between authority and the subordinates.

Next, he developed a pattern of three-level meetings. At the top, he himself, the superintendents, and the general foremen. At the middle level, the superintendents, general foremen, and foremen. Then the general foremen, foremen, and workers.

At the top level meeting, the American management chief set the pattern of encouraging his subordinates to challenge his own ideas, to come up with original thoughts. When his superintendents (also North Americans) disagreed with him, he made it clear that they were to state their objections fully. At first, the general foremen looked surprised and uneasy. They noted, however, that the senior men who argued with the boss were encouraged and praised. Timorously, with great hesitation, they began to add their own suggestions. As time went on, they more and more accepted the new convention and pitched in without inhibition.

The idea of challenging the boss with constructive new ideas gradually filtered down to the second and third level meetings. It took a lot of time and gentle handling, but out of this approach grew an extraordinary morale. The native general foremen and foremen developed new pride in themselves, accepted new responsibilities, even reached out for more. They began to work to improve their capacities and to look forward to moving up in the hierarchy.

Conformity or Adjustment?

To work with people, must we be just like them? Obviously not. If we try to conform completely, the Arab, the Latin American, the Italian, whoever he might be, finds our behavior confusing and insincere. He suspects our motive. We are expected to be different. But we are also expected to respect and accept the other people as they are. And we may, without doing violence to our own personalities, learn to communicate with them by observing the unwritten patterns they are accustomed to.

To be aware that there are pitfalls in cross-cultural dealings is the first big step forward. And to accept the fact that our convictions are in no respect more eternally "right" than someone else's is another constructive step.

Beyond these:

1. We can learn to control our so-called frankness in a culture which puts a high value on maintaining pleasant surface relations.

2. We can avoid expressing quick decisions when their utterance without a long period of polite preparation would show disrespect.

3. We can be on the lookout for the conversation patterns of nationals of whatever country we are in and accustom ourselves to closer quarters than we are used to. (This is uncomfortable at first but understanding the reason why it is important helps greatly.)

4. Where the situation demands it, we can learn to express our emotions more freely--most people find this rather exhilarating.

5. We can try to distinguish between the organizational practices which are really necessary to effectiveness and those that we employ from habit because they happen to be effective in the United States.

Research for Organizational Effectiveness

We have outlined a point of view the individual can seek to apply in order to increase his own effectiveness. Valuable as that may be, we must recognize the limitations of an individual approach. Since each family transported overseas represents an investment of between $25,000 and $100,000 per year to the organization, the losses involved in poor selection or inadequate training can be enormous.

While no ready-made answers are now available, research can serve the organization both in selection and training of personnel.

It would be a mistake to assume that the ideal training program would fit just any administrator effectively into any given culture. We must assume that some personalities will fit more readily than others. By the time man reaches adulthood, his personality is rather solidly formed, and basic changes are difficult if not impossible to induce. It is therefore important to work to improve the selection process so that men with little chance of fitting into a foreign culture will not be sent where they are bound to fail.

Our Latin-American case of Smith and Jones is relevant here. One who had observed Smith in his native setting should have been able to predict that he would not be effective in handling labor relations in Latin America. However, that statement is based upon the hindsight observation that there was a very obvious lack of fit between Smith's personality and the cultural requirements of his job. It remains for research men to devise schemes of observation and testing which will enable personnel men to base their selections upon criteria of personality and culture.

To what extent can training improve the effectiveness of individuals in intercultural communication? Training of men in overseas operations is going on all the time. So far as we know, little of it currently deals with the considerations outlined in this article. Until organizations are prepared to develop training along these lines--and support research on the effects of such training--we shall not know to what extent intercultural communications can be improved through training.

We do not mean to give the impression that behavioral scientists already have the knowledge needed regarding intercultural communication. What we have presented here is only a demonstration of the importance of the topic. We have not presented a systematic analysis of the problems of communication from culture A to culture B. We have just said in effect: "These are some of the things that are important. Watch out for them."

What more is needed? In the first place, the problem calls for a new emphasis in anthropological research. In the past, anthropologists have been primarily concerned with the internal pattern of a given culture. In giving attention to intercultural problems, they have examined the impact of one culture upon another. Very little attention has been given to the actual communication process between representatives of different cultures.

Much could be learned, for example, if we observed North Americans in interaction with people of another culture. We would want also to be able to interview both parties to the interaction to study how A was interpreting B and how B was interpreting A. In this way we might discover points of friction and miscommunication whose existence we now do not even suspect. Such studies, furthermore, would provide systematic knowledge much more useful than the fragments provided in this article.

THE CULTURAL CURTAIN

By Dorothy Lee

Programs of induced change are being initiated with increasing concern for the requirements of organization and planning, as well as for the technical training and selection of workers. Yet, throughout the years, their success or failure cannot be explained solely on the basis of these factors. Proposed changes which were clearly necessary and beneficial have often been summarily rejected by the people concerned, or have met with apathy and indifference. Programs have been launched successfully only to fail in the long run. Worse than this, the change itself has sometimes been readily accepted, but has brought unpremeditated results in its wake--destruction of the fabric of the society, loss of the meaning of life, and other unimaginable hardships.

The Factor of Culture

In such cases, the factor which has been overlooked, the factor which has made for difficulties of communication, is that of culture. Perhaps a proposed program runs completely counter to the religious tenets of a people. For example, it is reported that the Girl Scout manuals which were recently sent from the United States to a school in Indonesia were thrown away unused. The people to whom they were sent are Mohammedans, and they explained that as Moslems they found it abominable to have human beings equated with bears, beavers, and wolves, and to have girls urged to name themselves after animals.[1] Sometimes no account is taken of social groupings. In this country, when Navahos were resettled on irrigated farmland, the arrangements went counter to their established groupings. They were established as individual families of parents and children, far from their relatives, despite the fact that they had been used to working their fields co-operatively in larger units, along extended kinship lines. For these and similar reasons, the project did not prosper.[2]

Most of all, we have often been unaware of the importance of the totality of a way of life. Students of culture are coming to realize that any practice or concept is linked to, as well as supports, many other practices and beliefs which eventually constitute the whole cultural framework; and that it has a special function within this framework. A person from a different culture often finds it difficult to discover or recognize this function; it is easy to see the trait as merely a queer custom. So, in our ignorance, we have tampered with one trait, not realizing that thus we were actually tampering with the whole.

Until recent years, changes were introduced, whenever they appeared obviously necessary or desirable, by traders, missionaries, or colonial governments in a piecemeal or even haphazard fashion. Though some such changes were introduced through the rapacity of traders or the exigencies of colonization, many stemmed from humanitarian motives, and were clearly indicated at least in the eyes of the Western agents.

It was clear to workers in South Africa, for example, that when infants nursed until they were two or more they exhausted their mothers physically and interfered with their work. Bottle feeding was introduced. Soon the mothers were even more exhausted, because they began to bear children every year. The taboo on intercourse during lactation no longer worked to space their children at intervals of three or four years. Again, it was clear

---

[1]Arthur Goodfriend, Rice Roots. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958), p. 47.

[2]Tom Sasaki and John Adair's article in Human Problems in Technological Change, edited by Edward H. Spicer. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952), pp. 97-111.

to colonial governments and missionaries that infanticide and head-hunting, as well as the poor sanitation attending childbirth, were evils to be eradicated. Yet they never considered the results of such an eradication and were unprepared for the enormous increase in population in areas where population and food resources had previously been kept in balance. The consequence of their humanitarianism was overcrowding, malnutrition, and a sentence of emigration for people deeply attached to their homeland.

What went wrong here? The change had obviously been effectively introduced; it had been accepted by the people, or at any rate it had not been rejected. In fact, it had probably been welcomed. But this was not enough. The agents literally had not known what they were doing. They knew nothing of the cultural framework of the society with which they were dealing, and they tampered in ignorance with one of its sustaining parts. They knew nothing of the ecological relationship with the habitat which the culture helped maintain. This is not to say that, knowing this, they would have refrained from acting to save lives and abolish fear; but rather that they would have taken account of the function of the traits which they were changing or displacing, and then would have acted accordingly.

Recognition of Total Pattern

We have learned since then that, in taking account of the cultural factor, we have to consider not only the function which the trait serves within the whole cultural framework, but also the role the trait plays in relating man to his habitat. Man adjusts to his environment by means of his culture. When he moves to a cold climate, he does not grow fur. He builds an igloo and lives warmly in it, grouped closely with his family; or he invents central heating and makes possible the comfort and privacy which he values; or, like the Sioux, he teaches himself physical endurance, he exalts the virtue of hardihood and learns to take the cold in his stride proudly. But each society does this in its own way, meets its environment through its own particular culture, through a patterned constellation of traits. Sometimes the cultural adjustment works hardship on the members of the society and its neighbors, or is an out-and-out evil from the point of view of Western culture, as for example, infanticide and ritual murder. Sometimes, we merely regard a practice as wrong, or as based on ignorance and move in to help without considering the whole picture. So progressive Turkish farmers were persuaded by Western-educated Village Institute workers to remove from their fields the stones which served to keep the moisture in through the long dry weeks of the summer; as a result their crops withered, while those of the conservative farmers prospered.

In addition, we have learned to take into consideration the function of each trait as an integral part of the whole. We have learned that no trait is too small or unimportant to be manipulated safely, without repercussion. For instance, earlier in this century, an apparently slight and insignificant change was introduced among the Australian Yir Yoront. A Mission was established among them and the missionaries gave steel axes as gifts to adult men and women, and to young people of both sexes. The axe was not new to the Yir Yoront; they already had stone axes. Yet this one friendly gesture, according to Lauriston Sharp, is probably responsible for the eventual destruction of the entire internal social structure of the group as well as of its intertribal relationships.

The ownership of an axe had been up to then, a badge of adult masculinity. Traditionally, only adult men could own them. Axes were loaned by an adult man to a younger man, and by a man to a woman; and along these established lines of axe-borrowing fell the relations between man and wife, older brother and younger brother, father and son. Now axes were owned by women and young men, and the established relations became confused. The symbol of authority was lost and authority itself became unclear; this gave rise to confusion, and to the insecurity of uncertainty. In addition, the stone for the axes was quarried far to the south, and was traded north along a route of trade partners, who also participated in the ceremonials of one another's groups. All these relations, all this participation in the rich life of the ceremonials of other groups, was now lost. The small and obviously desirable change from stone to steel axes turned out to be neither insignificant nor beneficial.[3]

---

[3]Lauriston Sharp's article in ibid., pp. 69-90.

Culture Taken into Account

To balance such unfortunate occurrences, we have many cases where change has been introduced with happy results, by agents who have had knowledge and understanding of the culture of the group with which they were dealing. Such is the work of the British Health Centre in Natal, which was established in 1940. These workers studied the ramifications of the entire culture, as well as the history of the Zulu group with which they were dealing. According to the report written in 1953, the comprehensive health program they proposed to institute suggested the introduction of change in three areas: in food habits, in the treatment of tuberculosis, and in practices which led to erosion. The first of these was definitely successful; the second only partially so; and the third was not attempted because investigation showed that if it could have been effectively introduced, it would have taken away from the people practices which were of great value to them.

The first undertaking was of a kind which is usually very difficult to carry out. The effect of malnutrition is not directly demonstrable; it is difficult to explain to people why a change in their food habits is necessary. Why interfere with them? What harm do they do? An attempt to change them usually meets, in addition, obstacles stemming from the emotional and symbolic significance of food. Among the Zulu, general resistance stemmed from their close tie to their ancestors. This, they said, had been the diet of the ancestors; it was the sanctioned diet. The ancestors, who were concerned with the daily affairs of the people, would be angered if the diet was changed. The team, however, armed with history, showed the people that the diet had in fact been richer and more varied in ancestral times, before the coming of the Whites.

There were additional difficulties when it came to the attempt to increase the consumption of milk, particularly among women of childbearing age. These came from a taboo protecting the cattle, which represented perhaps the greatest value to the Zulu. Women, in any reproductive capacity, while pregnant or lactating or lochial or while menstruating, were dangerous to the cattle, and should therefore avoid all contact with them; to consume milk was to come into such contact. To prevent all possibility of error, girls after pubescence were forbidden milk at all times. In addition, people could consume the milk only of the right cattle; these were the cattle owned by the head of the household to whose kinship group they belonged. This meant that, if they were away from the appropriate cattle, they could not include milk in their diet.

The team of workers recognized and respected the strength of the religious beliefs that supported these customs. They did not attempt to tamper with them. Instead, they hit upon a simple solution. They introduced powdered milk. Though the nature of this was known, it could not be associated either symbolically or emotionally with cattle.

In their attack on tuberculosis, the team of workers again met resistance. For people who found deep satisfaction in eating out of a common dish and living in close contact with friends and relatives, the concept of isolation was thoroughly unacceptable. To go to a hospital a hundred miles away, to be long ill away from all loved ones, to face the probability of dying away from home and the protection of the ancestors, was a terrifying prospect. Besides, the Zulu had no reason to doubt the efficacy of their curative methods. These stemmed logically from a set of premises which the Western workers could not prove to be wrong, although they knew them to be so. Through a consistent effort at understanding and responding to the cultural roots of the resistance, the workers finally did make some progress in changing methods of treatment. However, they had to abandon their plan to enlighten the people as to how tuberculosis was spread because, to these Zulu, any disease associated with labored breathing or pains in the chest was due to the machinations of an ill-wisher. Therefore to tell a father that his daughter had brought tuberculosis into the family would be to accuse her of being an evil witch. If they had insisted on keeping their Western plan of a "good" attack on tuberculosis, they would have endangered their entire tuberculosis program.

When the team came to consider the question of erosion, they found out that the pressing need was for the reduction of the herds of cattle. Yet the meaning of life for the Zulu man was bound up with the lives of his cattle. He saw in them the link between himself

and his ancestors. With them he validated his marriages, and created and strengthened all affinal bonds. He knew and loved each one of his cattle, each detail of their personal appearance and each idiosyncracy. To ask these people to reduce their herds would have been tantamount to asking them to destroy a loved family member or the strength of their social bonds, or to give up an important part of the value of life. So the team abandoned this part of their program, at least temporarily; they wisely decided to refrain from destroying value.[4] In fact, the people's values would probably have defeated all attempts to institute voluntary reduction of herds.

Values and Change

The factor of values is often responsible for the rejection of a proposed change. For instance, the Baiga of Central India refused to be persuaded to change from a digging stick to a plough in the cultivation of their fields. The earth for them was a generous, loved and kindly mother. With a stick they could help her gently to bring forth fruit for them; they could not bring themselves to cut her "with knives."[5]

In fact, when attempts at mechanization, or even at the introduction of an iron plough to replace the light wooden plough, have necessitated the consolidation of scattered holdings into one continuous field, they have sometimes been defeated by this factor of value. People have not wanted to part with one small plot in exchange for another contiguous to their other holdings because, as Dube says of the village his group studied, "The earth occupies a mother's position, and parting with any fragment of it is nearly tantamount to separation from the Mother."[6]

Fertilization of arable land has also been widely rejected on the basis of value, in this case of the value of what we might call autonomy--the autonomy of land and plants. So Cambodian farmers have generally rejected fertilization as interference.[7] And in Ettawah, a village leader saw green manuring as an act of violence against the living plant: "Green manuring involves a very cruel act of plowing under the sanhemp leaf and stalk before they are ripe. This act involves violence."[8]

If we manage to change the practices of such people without understanding the function they serve we may be taking away from them sources of deep emotional satisfaction and security. If what they see us urging them to do is a violation of the rights of land and nature in general, we are also forfeiting their respect, and our claims to democratic principles will accordingly be considered hypocritical.

However, a profound knowledge of the culture may help the worker to rest his proposed change upon the basis of the cultural values, and even to enlist these in his work. This has been done by perceptive agents of change. In Ettawah, for instance, when the worker suggested green manuring as a means for greater agricultural production, the leader countered rejecting all improvement: "Our culture teaches us not to be too greedy or anxious

---

[4]John Cassel's article in Health, Culture and Community, edited by Benjamin David Paul (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955), pp. 15-41.

[5]Verrier Elwin, The Baiga (London: J. Murray, 1939), pp. 106-107.

[6]Shyama Charan Dube, Indian Village (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1955), pp. 75-76.

[7]David J. Steinberg and others, Cambodia: Its People, Its Society, Its Culture (New Haven, Conn.: HRAF Press, 1957), p. 201.

[8]Albert Mayer and others, Pilot Project, India (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1958), p. 209.

for more economic production. Remember that Kabir, the saint poet, prayed to God, 'Give me only so much wealth that my family may meet its average needs, that I may not remain hungry, and that the saints or mendicants may not go away from my door hungry.'" The worker, versed in the principles of Brahmanism, argued convincingly that it was important to increase production, since most villagers found themselves unable to meet these sacred obligations to the family, the religious mendicants, and themselves.[9]

Cross-Cultural Communication

There is more to effective cross-cultural relations, however, than the recognition of the integrity of culture and a respect for cultural values. The entire structure of premises and assumptions differs from culture to culture. The background of concepts and categories and expectations which shapes our perceptions differs; and the symbolic meaning of an act differs according to cultural background.

I see a Cretan woman, for instance, meticulously picking up every breadcrumb which has fallen on the floor.[10] What I see is a house-proud woman, keeping her floor unlittered, neat and clean. Someone else sees a hungry woman, saving every scrap of food. But the Cretan woman is neither. She is not performing a utilitarian act; to her it has a religious significance. She is fulfilling a sacred duty to bread, the sacred food. If she leaves it on the floor, she may be responsible for an act of sacrilege; someone might step on it and thus desecrate it. Therefore, it is imperative for me, not only to observe this act, but to perceive it in terms of the framework in which it finds its motivation and derives its meaning. Otherwise I might be tempted to give the woman food, or a broom, in an irrelevant and possibly insulting attempt to help.

The woman's act conveyed reverence; it was a meaningful rather than a utilitarian act. And the meaning of an act is hard for the foreign agent to discover. Yet to overlook symbolic or religious meaning is often disastrous. We have made such mistakes, as when, to combat Communism, we made posters showing pictures of great religious figures contrasted to pictures of Stalin and Lenin; to the Moslem Indonesians a pictured Mohammed was anathema.[11]

It is also a mistake to assume that our own symbols are universal. Thus, for me to seat a guest on my right is to show him public honor; my Chinese guest would view this as a slight since for him the left is the place of honor. To me, a room of my own means coveted privacy and convenience, as well as prestige. If my firm gives me a desk in an office shared with others, or my hostess offers the only guest room to another friend and expects me to double up with the children, I shall probably feel slighted. To people of another culture, a room of one's own may spell rejection or deprivation.

At best, to be blind to the symbolism of the culture with which we are dealing may mean that we cannot communicate effectively. And we cannot depend on our own inventiveness, or our knowledge of so-called human nature. We have to discover the symbols of the people with whom we are dealing. I know that it would never have occurred to me to teach reading with the imagery which Nahuatl teachers were advised by the Mexican government to use: Introducing the words as friends, urging the child to search for his new friend in the population of the page, and later in other such "communities."[12] Yet symbolic meaning can be discovered; the examples I have given so far have all been reported by perceptive people coming from outside the cultural group they were observing.

---

[9]Ibid., pp. 208-209.

[10]Leland G. Allbaugh, A Case Study of an Underdeveloped Area (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1953), p. 104.

[11]Goodfriend, op. cit. (note 1 supra), p. 18.

W. D. Preston, "Reviews," International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. 16 (January 1950), p. 58.

Another obstacle to cross-cultural communication is the difference in perception between people of different cultural backgrounds. Here the foreign agent of change labors under a double handicap. He perceives according to his own familiar categories, and he is perceived according to unfamiliar categories. The anthropologist, Malinowski, working with South Sea islanders forty years ago, was asked what kind of magic he used to grow yams in England. This question assumed fallaciously that Malinowski farmed, that when he farmed he naturally grew yams, and that he worked magic over his yams. Our questions must often be as irrelevant when we deal with people in cross-cultural situations, but the assumptions behind them are usually held unconsciously and are therefore hard to eradicate. A young Hopi schoolboy, the Christian son of a Christian mother who had herself attended a white mission school, recently asked a white visitor to what clan she belonged. Many anthropologists return from field trips unaware of having made equivalent mistakes.

An occurrence is often perceived as a fact according to the precepts of the culture. The Hopi Talayesua, for example, knowing four to be the valid number, perceives that cocks crow four times before daybreak.[13] We observe the unhurried pace of others and perceive them as lazy or inefficient, yet Jane Belo, who describes the sauntering of the Balinese, goes on to speak of her neighbors in Bali, who--a family with two children of eight and ten--"sauntered" fifty miles to a temple and back in less than twelve hours.[14]

And so our own acts, our own motivations, are usually perceived not as we see them but according to the cultural framework of those who see us. It is enlightening to read how the Sioux chief, Sitting Bull, perceived the achievements of civilization in the eighteen seventies: "They claim this mother of ours, the Earth, for their own use, and fence their neighbors away from her, and deface her with their buildings and their refuse. They compel her to produce out of season, and when sterile she is made to take medicine in order to produce again. All this is sacrilege."[15]

Throughout the world, we have offered material aid to groups of people who recognize responsibility only to their families and their relatives, and cannot understand why anyone should want to help complete strangers. We saw ourselves as generous, or as laudable for recognizing our responsibility; they often saw us as naive, perhaps stupid; or they could explain our queer act only as an attempt at a form of bribery.

Logical Tenets

In Western culture, we have the notion of opposites which are mutually exclusive. This notion shapes our thinking as well as our acts, and has made for much difficulty in our attempts to introduce change among people who do not have this notion. Among most societies of my own knowledge this notion does not exist. What we call opposites do not oppose, nor do they exclude each other. A test which was recently given to Zuni children based on pairs of opposites failed because "good" and "bad," for example, were not opposites for the Zuni.

In China, our mutually exclusive opposites enclose a complementary whole. In Japan, they set limits for the "in-between path of moderation." In such societies we have not "either-or" but "either-and." Our Western workers have to introduce change to people who can hold two contradictory stands simultaneously, and who cannot see why we insist that they give up the old while accepting the new.

---

[13]Leo W. Simmons, Sun Chief, The Autobiography of a Hopi Indian (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1942), p. 62.

[14]Jane Belo, in Personal Character and Cultural Milieu, edited by Douglas G. Haring (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1956), pp. 158-159.

[15]Quoted in Charles A. Eastman, Indian Heroes and Great Chieftains (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1927), p. 120.

The co-existence of either-or is in fact very common throughout the world. Chinese Communist leaders made use of it, as the yin-yang principle, in presenting thought control and decentralization to the people as complementary. In the United States, the Navajo see no difficulty in considering their divine beings as simultaneously good and bad, and a sick man, in becoming identified with such a being during the curing process, asks to become both good and bad.

We take it for granted that certain conclusions follow from certain premises. We learn, for instance, that the Cambodians are not attached to their land and are ready to leave it and acquire another piece. So we conclude from this that they are therefore ready to contemplate study in a foreign country or to emigrate. But we are wrong. In fact, it seems that most Cambodians would rather be executed than leave their homeland since, if Cambodians die elsewhere, their souls may be unable to find their way back to be reborn as Cambodian. Their constitution outlaws punishment by exile as too harsh a sentence.[16]

Progress and Aspirations

Many of us in Western society assume that progress is good and is naturally recognized as such by all. But in many other societies progress is not a goal, nor a desired good beckoning to action. We can possibly introduce change to these people as the eradication of ills, but not in the name of the "bigger and better," or even of the new. We have assumed that, if people had a higher income, they would spend it in the interests of what is in our own view a higher standard of living; we have found to our confusion that this is not necessarily so. From the Middle East, from the Far East, from Africa come reports that when the price of agricultural products or the level of wages is raised, people work less since they can maintain their known and tried way of life with less effort. We have learned that people have to be helped to recognize their wants and aspirations. And beyond this, we have helped them to see that it is possible to achieve what they want, to translate their dreams into plans. Occasionally, we have interfered to the extent of creating aspirations where none seemed to be present.

The obstacles presented by cultural differences have often been overcome. Many cases such as that of the comprehensive health program among the Zulu, carefully and reflectively undertaken, have been reported in recent years. Planned change is also being brought about by people working in their own countries who know the culture they are dealing with, its symbolism, its values, and its pattern of perception. So Ibn Saud quoted the Koran over the radio and the telephone when inaugurating these systems,[17] Chinese Communists reinterpreted Confucianism in support of Communist ethics,[18] and Japanese architects used their understanding of native notions of space and family relations to achieve the miracle of housing families in a net space of 380 feet square.[19] In this country, we are studying profitably the introduction of these changes. To this, and to our increasing awareness of the factor of culture in experience and communication, we can add what we already have as our heritage--an understanding of the technology we are introducing within the cultural framework of which it is a part.

---

[16]Steinberg, op. cit. (note 7 supra), pp. 42 and 36.

[17]Carl C. Taylor and others, Experience with Human Factors in Agricultural Areas in the World, United States Department of Agriculture, Extension Service, No. 1018, 1949, p. 19 (Multigraphed). See also Najmeh Najafi, Reveille for a Persian Village (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958) and Ernestine Friedl, "Hospital Care in Greece," Human Organization, Vol. 16 (Winter 1958), pp. 24-27.

[18]David S. Nivison, Communist Ethics and Chinese Tradition (Cambridge: Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1954), pp. 18-20 (mimeo).

Saburo Asaba, "Housing Design Problems for Japan Housing Corporation," Papers of The Sixth International Conference of Design at Aspen, Colorado, June, 1956.

Regional Council for International Education

THE LEARNING PROCESS IN AN INTERCULTURAL SETTING*

By Stephen H. Rhinesmith and David S. Hoopes

As business, study, and travel opportunities increase on an international scale, there is a growing recognition of the need to find the similarities which exist among the peoples of the world. Although desirable, this awareness can be the source of intercultural problems for the individual who accepts them too readily. The anticipations it creates, fostered by the relative ease of international travel, can be deceptive for persons with little or no experience in meeting the demands of personal adjustment required in a new environment. Insensitivity to the real differences which exist between cultures has often led to misunderstanding and frustration resulting in unsuccessful business transactions, unrewarding student experiences and disappointing vacations.

It is the contention of this paper, therefore, that persons can function successfully abroad only when they are: 1) aware of themselves as culturally conditioned individuals; 2) alert to the differences in perception which exist between themselves and others; 3) aware of their own social and emotional needs and attentive to those same needs in others and 4) are willing to work actively toward meaningful relationships with others through the development of skills, communication and interpersonal association. The following statement suggests a method of preparing persons for intercultural encounters by developing in the individual a sensitivity to the traditions, beliefs, and behavior of himself and others.

The Process of Intercultural Adjustment

Problems of personal adjustment to a foreign environment have frequently been referred to as "culture shock." This phenomenon is usually precipitated by the anxiety which results from the sudden loss of familiar surroundings. A person experiences frustration and irritation as he constantly finds his "natural" way of behaving to be in conflict with the life style of those around him. In addition, continual uncertainty and ambiguity about how he should act and react causes a certain amount of discomfort and uneasiness.

Over the years, four distinctive patterns of responses to "culture shock" have been identified. These methods of dealing with the new and unfamiliar may be described as "flight," "dependency," "fight," and "adaptation." When a person responds to a new situation through flight he rejects those people and things around him which cause his discomfort and withdraws from interaction with them. In each instance, the individual places "blame" either on the local population for a lack of "understanding," or on himself for inadequacy in handling the new experience. The result is that the individual takes some defensive measure such as flight to fellow nationals in a foreign enclave or some other regressive action as a means to remove the threatening atmosphere and reinstate the security of the familiar.

Dependency may be identified by extreme behavior in the opposite direction. In such cases, the individual does not flee from his host culture by joining a foreign

---

*Reading Materials, from Intercultural Communications Workshop, Regional Council for International Education, University of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Pa., Aug. 28-Sept. 2, 1967.

enclave, but instead flees from his own national identity by becoming dependent on the host culture. Such behavior, known to some as "going native," is also a means of reducing tension. The ultimate effects of denying one's own cultural identity, however, may in the long-run be more harmful than beneficial.

Other persons respond to a new culture with hostility and aggression. They become irritated with those around them for making them feel ill-at-ease and as a result become determined to "show the native how we do it at home." Such individuals fight the new environment, trying to change the culture to which they have come, rather than attempting to understand it and respond to it. They tend to assume, often unconsciously, that it is the responsibility of the host culture to adapt to them, rather than the other way around, blithely ignoring or unaware of the absurdity of such an expectation.

All of the above three modes of behavior are really maladjusted reactions to a new environment. In each case the person will in some way be inhibited from functioning with full effectiveness as a foreign national in a host culture. There are some, however, who begin the slow and painstaking process of cultural adaptation and adjustment. These individuals neither reject themselves nor others, but rather try to adapt to the new situation through constant openness to learning and behavioral growth. This requires an ability and desire to listen for the responses, both verbal and non-verbal, of those around them. At the same time, these persons must develop an awareness of the messages which they are sending out and the possible interpretations which others might make of them. In short, such individuals refine and expand their skills in inter-personal communication.

Learning how to Learn

We have defined intercultural adaptation and adjustment as a process of continual learning through interpersonal communication. There is, however, another dimension to the learning process--this is the skill of "learning how to learn."

It is generally accepted that the physical growth of every individual is accompanied by a certain social and emotional growth as well. Although the former is readily observable and quite easy to measure, the characteristics of the latter are easy neither to measure nor to evaluate. Many times, the only means we have to gauge the extent of our social and emotional development is through the response of those around us. Our social growth is thus based upon the norms, expectations, values, and beliefs of those with whom we have grown up or spent our lives. In such situations, it is seldom that we stop and attempt objectively to "take stock" of the significance of our beliefs or ways of behaving. We, and those around us, accept our behavior as "natural" and correct.

Further, it is from this familiar world and the experiences we share with those who inhabit it that we derive many if not all of our identities. We define ourselves to a large degree by the roles we play and the relationships we have with our human and physical environments.

When we move to an intercultural setting we are faced with the necessity of reassessing our accepted value and behavioral systems. We must measure them against new and, in most cases, markedly different systems which cannot be dismissed as inferior or irrelevant because they will play an important part in the achievement of the goals which we have set for ourselves. The result may be a discovery that our "cultural vision" is highly resistant to change. We become defensive when we find out that there are certain beliefs which are "frozen" in our way of thinking. We find it difficult to understand or tolerate persons with conflicting beliefs. The reconsideration of many of these "frozen" values, attitudes, and ideals is, however, a crucial process and necessary to successful intercultural adjustment. For it is by this process that personal growth and expanded cultural vision can be realized, resulting in a greater awareness and understanding of our new environment.

Related to this challenge to one's value system is the occurrence of an identity crisis within the individual, though it may not appear as such to him. When one is cut off suddenly from the environment from which he derives most of his self-identifications, he is very likely to be subject to a great deal of inexplicable anxiety, some of which can be traced to a sense of threatened or lost identity. Furthermore, he is confronted with new identities which he must come to understand and accept if he is going to function effectively. The first and perhaps most significant of these is that of "foreigner." For very close to the heart of culture shock lies a reaction to the extremely unpleasant feeling of being an outsider.

Like our values and attitudes, our identities and self-concepts also tend to be frozen into behavior patterns relevant to our own cultural environment. In an intercultural setting, as we have seen, our identities change. Often, however, our behavior remains the same. The visitor, in confronting the consequent adjustment problems, sometimes suffers from what M. Brewster Smith has aptly called "a circumstance of beleaguered self-esteem." In such a situation he must conquer the anxiety he feels while at the same time developing the capacity to adjust to the new roles and the new learning about himself which are imposed upon him by the new environment.

In undergoing this experience he is involved in a learning process which has been conceptualized by some as a three-phase cycle of "unfreezing-moving-refreezing." Of the three phases, the first is usually the most difficult, requiring the breakdown of ethnocentric biases which have distorted cultural vision for so many years. No matter how much an individual may want to learn, he brings to a new environment a certain ambivalence and resistance to learning and change. Behavior change is threatening because it raises questions of personal inadequacies to meet new challenges which might produce failure and ridicule, and because it stimulates anxieties over the potential impact of the change on one's concept of himself, indeed, on the very nature of his "self."

Once this fear has been overcome, however, a person is ready to learn. The "moving" or second phase refers to the actual process of expanding one's cultural vision through the readjustment of attitudes and perceptions as he becomes more aware of the alternative perspectives which are available to him. This is the phase of actual "learning" when the individual accepts or rejects new experiences and re-evaluates his past and present perceptions in order to form a framework for future behavior.

In the third phase, "refreezing," the individual "locks in place" his new perceptions and way of behaving so that regression to a previous mode of behavior will not readily occur. At this point, we may say that a behavioral or attitudinal "change" has taken place. The extent, nature, and duration of this change, however, depend very much upon the re-enforcements which are supplied thereafter and the extent to which the new perceptions formed coincide with those held by friends and associates with whom the individual will be working and living from day to day.

Steps in the Learning Process

Having examined intercultural adjustment problems and the learning process in general let us delve a little more in detail into what is actually involved in unfreezing, changing and refreezing attitudes and behaviors.

It can be postulated from what has been said above that learning to function effectively in an intercultural setting is a process of behavioral and attitudinal change in which one learns new responses both to new challenges to one's values, beliefs and behaviors and to new communications about oneself. In short, intercultural learning means discovering how to learn not only about others but about oneself as well.

Further, it is a process of experiential learning, a learning that flows from doing and feeling as well as thinking. The extent, however, to which behavioral change is elaborated, enhanced and fixed in the conduct pattern of the behavior depends to a

significant degree on the fullness to which he becomes aware of the experiential process from which the change has emerged.

That process can be outlined as follows:

The conditions for learning must be created. This requires an atmosphere of trust in and support of one another, an atmosphere in which friendship can develop. This can occur in one-to-one relationships or in a group. In such an atmosphere, the masks--the roles, manners, and surface attitudes with which we normally confront the world in order to protect our inner selves from harm--can be dropped. We can risk exposing our true attitudes and behaviors because we trust the friends we have made.

We must then be willing to give and receive help--or, in communication theory, give and receive feedback. Feedback enables us to see ourselves from an external perspective and determine if our attitudes and behaviors actually mean and achieve what we intend them to, whether there are incongruities between our self-image and the image we project to others. The more people involved in this process the better since feedback from one source can immediately be checked and tested against that from other sources.

At this point the basic problems of intercultural communication and the differences in perceptual systems among cultures--and indeed among individuals--must be confronted squarely. It must be accepted that intercultural communication involves a complex relationship involving two (or more) people and requiring patience, understanding and interest. Communication means not only making oneself understood, but understanding others as well; not only receiving help,but giving help. The process does not go in one direction, but involves an exchange. In a new or foreign environment differences in the perception and interpretation of events are multiplied a hundred fold and the ability to establish and maintain meaningful relationships which get us beyond culture to our common humanity becomes even more dependent upon feedback and the communications process.

With the establishment of satisfactory communication and effective inter-personal relationships the unfreezing can take place. Cultural barriers are lowered and cultural stereotypes discarded. We are now ready to get down to those concerns which are universally shared by human beings regardless of cultural conditioning (but which are difficult if not impossible to reach until we are aware of the extent to which we are imprisoned by our own cultures). Old attitudes and behaviors can now be exposed and feedback upon them obtained. The results can be examined and new attitudes and behaviors which might better meet the needs of the environment in which you find yourself can be experimented with.

But the significance of the experience must be analyzed and understood. This is sometimes called making a "cognitive map" of the process of learning through which one is going. In this way one is better able to accept or reject new behaviors and attitudes and recognize the relationship of his immediate experience to his normal day-to-day role.

Now one is ready to refreeze or incorporate accepted new behaviors into his general behavioral framework, discarding the old and unuseful in the process. The new behaviors must be consciously reinforced through action.

In the end the individual will know how to learn about himself. Indeed he will have learned about himself. His accomplishments will be threefold. First, he will know how to learn about himself and how to manage behavioral change. Second, he will know much more about himself and his ability to function in an intercultural setting. Third, he will have developed an awareness of and consequent openness or flexibility toward the need to determine the nature of perceptual differences between himself and others before expecting communication to take place, friendship to develop or effective working relationships to be established.

CULTURE SHOCK AND THE PROBLEM OF ADJUSTMENT TO NEW CULTURAL ENVIRONMENTS

By Dr. Kalvero Oberg*

We would like to make a few remarks about culture shock, a malady which afflicts most of us to some degree. We might almost call culture shock an occupational disease of many people who have been suddenly transplanted abroad.

Culture shock is brought on by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. These signs or cues include the thousand and one ways in which we orient ourselves to the situations of daily life: when to shake hands and what to say when we meet people, when and how to give tips, how to give orders to servants, how to make purchases, when to accept and when to refuse invitations, when to take statements seriously and when not. Now these cues which may be words, gestures, facial expressions, customs, or norms are acquired by all of us in the course of growing up and are as much a part of our culture as the language we speak or the beliefs we accept. All of us depend for our peace of mind and our efficiency on hundreds of these cues, most of which we are <u>not consciously aware</u>.

Now when an individual enters a strange culture, all or most of these familiar cues are removed. He or she is like a fish out of water. No matter how broadminded or full of good will he may be, a series of props have been knocked from under him. This is followed by a feeling of frustration and anxiety. People react to the frustration in much the same way. <u>First, they reject the environment which causes the discomfort: "The ways of the host country are bad because they make us feel bad."</u> When Americans or other Foreigners in a strange land get together to grouse about the host country and its people, you can be sure they are suffering from culture shock. Another phase of culture shock is <u>regression</u>. The home environment suddenly assumes a tremendous importance. To an American everything American becomes irrationally glorified. All the difficulties and problems are forgotten and only the good things back home are remembered. It usually takes a trip home to bring one back to reality.

Some of the symptoms of culture shock are: excessive concern over cleanliness and the feeling that what is new and strange is "dirty." This could be in relation to drinking water, food, dishes, and bedding; fear of physical contact with attendants or servants; a feeling of helplessness and a desire for dependence on long-term residents of one's own nationality; irritation of delays and other minor frustrations, out of proportion to their causes; delay and outright refusal to learn the language of the host country; excessive fear of being cheated, robbed, or injured; great concern over minor pains and eruptions of the skin; and finally, that terrible longing to be back home, to be in familiar surroundings, to visit one's relatives, and in general, to talk to people who really "make sense."

Individuals differ greatly in the degree in which culture shock affects them. Although it is not common, there are individuals who cannot live in foreign countries. Those who have seen people go through a serious case of culture shock and on to a satisfactory adjustment can discern steps in the process. During the first few weeks most individuals are fascinated by the new. They stay in hotels and associate with nationals who speak their language and are polite and gracious to foreigners. This honeymoon stage

---

*An edited talk made some years ago by Dr. Oberg, Anthropologist, Health, Welfare and Housing Division US AID/Brazil.

may last from a few days or weeks to six months, depending on circumstances. If one is a very important person, he or she will be shown the show places, will be pampered and petted, and in a press interview will speak glowingly about the progress, goodwill, and international amity, and if he returns home may well write a book about his pleasant if superficial experience abroad.

But this "Cook's tour" type of mentality does not normally last if the foreign visitor remains abroad and has seriously to cope with real conditions of life. It is then that the second stage begins, characterized by a hostile and aggressive attitude towards the host country. This hostility evidently grows out of the genuine difficulty which the visitor experiences in the process of adjustment. There is mail trouble, school trouble, language trouble, house trouble, transportation trouble, shopping trouble, and the fact that people in the host country are largely indifferent to all these troubles. They help, but they just don't understand your great concern over these difficulties. Therefore, they must be insensible and unsympathetic to you and your worries; the result, "I just don't like them." You become aggressive, you band together with your fellow countrymen and criticize the host country, its ways, and its people. But this criticism is not an objective appraisal but a derogatory one. Instead of trying to account for conditions as they are through an honest analysis of the actual conditions and the historical circumstances which have created them, you talk as if the difficulties you experienced are more or less created by the people of the host country for your special discomfort. You take refuge in the colony of your countrymen and its cocktail circuit, which often becomes the fountain-head of emotionally charged labels known as stereotypes. This is a peculiar kind of invidious shorthand which caricatures the host country and its people in a negative manner. The "dollar grasping American" and the "indolent Latin American" are samples of mild forms of stereotypes. The use of stereotypes may salve the ego of someone with a severe case of culture shock, but certainly does not lead to any genuine understanding of the host country and its people. This second stage of culture shock is in a sense a crisis in the disease.

As the visitor succeeds in getting some knowledge of the language and begins to get around by himself, the beginning of his adjustment to the new cultural environment is taking place. He may still have difficulties, but he takes a "This is my cross and I have to bear it" attitude. Usually in this stage the visitor begins to become interested in the people of the host country. His sense of humor begins to assert itself. Instead of criticizing, he jokes about the people and even cracks jokes about his or her own difficulties. He or she is now on the way to recovery. And there is also the poor devil who is worse off than yourself whom you can help which in turn gives you confidence in your ability to speak and get around.

In the final stage of adjustment, the visitor accepts the customs of the country as just another way of living. He can operate within the new milieu without a feeling of anxiety, although there are moments of strain. Only with a complete grasp of all the cues of social intercourse will this strain disappear. For a long time the individual will understand what the national is saying, but he is not always sure what the national means. With a complete adjustment, you not only accept the foods, drinks, habits, and customs, but actually begin to enjoy them. When you go on home leave, you may even take things back with you, and if you leave for good, you generally miss the country and the people to whom you have become accustomed.

It might be well to point out that the difficulties which the newcomer experiences are very real. If individuals come to a tropical area from a temperate one, they quite often suffer from intestinal disturbances. Strange foods sometimes upset people. In Rio, for instance, water and power shortages are very real. When these physical difficulties are added to those arising from not knowing how to communicate and the uncertainties presented by strange customs, the consequent frustrations and anxieties are understandable. In the course of time, however, an individual makes his adjustment; you do what is essential about water, food, and other minutiae of daily life. You adapt yourself to water and power shortages and to traffic problems. In short, the environment does not change. What has changed is your attitude towards it. Somehow it no longer troubles you, you no longer project your discomforts onto the people of the host country and their ways. In short, you get along under a new set of living conditions.

Another important point worth considering is the attitude of others to a person suffering from culture shock. If you are frustrated and have an aggressive attitude to the people of the host country, they will sense this hostility and, in many cases, response moves from a preliminary phase of ingratiation to aggressive ridicule and on to avoidance. To your own countrymen who are well adjusted you become somewhat of a problem. As you feel weak in the face of the host country people, you tend to wish to increase your dependence on your fellow countrymen much more than is normal. Some will try to help you, others will not. The better your fellow countryman understands your condition, the better he is able to help you. But the difficulty is that culture shock has not been studied carefully enough for people to help you in an organized manner, and you continue to be considered a bit queer, until you adjust yourself to the new situation. In general, we might say that until an individual has achieved a satisfactory adjustment, he is not able to fully play his part on the job or as a member of the community. In a sense he is a sick person with a mild or severe case of culture shock as the case may be. Although we are not certain, we think culture shock affects wives more than it does their husbands. The husband has his professional duties to occupy him, and his activities may not differ too much from what he has been accustomed to. The wife, on the other hand, has to operate in an environment which differs much more from the milieu in which she grew up; consequently the strain on her is greater.

In an effort to get over culture shock, we think there is some value in knowing something about the nature of culture and its relationship to the individual. In addition to living in a physical environment, an individual lives in a cultural environment, consisting of man-made physical objects, social institutions, and ideas and beliefs. An individual is not born with culture but only with the capacity to learn it and use it. There is nothing in a new-born child which dictates that it should eventually speak Portuguese, English, or French, nor that he eat with a fork in his left hand rather than in the right, or use chop sticks. All these things the child has to learn. Nor are the parents responsible for the culture which they transmit to their young. The culture of any people is the product of history and is built up over time largely through processes which are, as far as the individual is concerned, beyond his awareness. It is by means of culture that the young learn to adapt themselves to the physical environment and to the people with whom they associate. And as we know, children and adolescents often experience difficulties in this process of learning and adjustment. But once learned, culture becomes a way of life, the sure, familiar largely automatic way of getting what you want from your environment, and, as such, it also becomes a value. People have a way of accepting their culture as the best and the only way of doing things. This is perfectly normal and understandable. To this attitude we give the name ethnocentricism, a belief that your culture, your race, and your nation form the center of the world. Individuals identify themselves with their own group and its ways to the extent that any critical comment is taken as an affront to the individual as well as to the group. If you criticize my country, you are criticizing me. If you criticize me, you are criticizing my country. Along with this attitude goes the tendency to attribute all individual peculiarities as <u>national</u> characteristics. For instance, if an American does something odd or antisocial in a foreign country, which back home would be considered a perfectly individual act, this is now considered a national trait. Instead of being censured as an individual, his country is censured. It is thus best to recognize that ethnocentricism is a characteristic of national groups. If a national criticizes some aspect of his own culture, the foreigner should listen but not enter into the criticism.

We mentioned a moment ago that specific cultures are the products of historical development and can be understood, not by referring to the biological or psychological peculiarities of its human carriers, but to an understanding of the antecedent and the concomitant elements of the culture themselves. Brazil and the United States, for instance, have different cultural origins and different culture histories, which account for present-day differences. In this case, however, the differences are not great, both cultures being parts of Western civilization. It might be useful to recognize here that the study of culture per se is not the study of individuals. Psychology is the study of individual personality. Sociology is the study of groups and group behavior. The student of culture studies, not human individuals, but the inter-relationships of cultural forms like technologies, institutions, idea and belief systems. In this talk we are interested not so

much in the study of culture as such, but its impact upon the individual under special conditions.

Now, any modern nation is a complex society with corresponding variations in culture. In composition, it is made up of different ethnic groups; it is stratified into classes; it is differentiated into regions; it is separated into rural and urban settlements, each having its distinctive cultural characteristics. Yet, superimposed upon these differences are the common elements of official language, institutions, and customs which knit it together to form a nation.

These facts indicate that it is not a simple matter to acquaint oneself with the culture of a nation. Similarly the culture of one's own nation is complex. It, too, differs by region and class. Americans, for instance, who go abroad in various governmental and business capacities, are usually members of the middle class and carry the values and aspirations of this class, some of which are an accent on the practical or utilitarian work as a means of personal success, and suspicion of personal authority. Accustomed to work in large hierarchical institutions like business corporations, governmental agencies, or scientific foundations which have a life of their own and persist in time, Americans tend to become impersonal. Individuals, no matter how able, are replaceable parts in these large institutions. To Americans, personalism, which emphasizes a special individual, like a political leader or a business leader or religious leader as solely responsible for the existence and success of an institution, is somewhat strange. To the American it is the organization that counts, individuals being judged according to their ability to fit into the organization. This difference in interpersonal relationships often becomes at least a minor shock. A new pattern has to be established which takes into consideration class society, the symbols of individual status, the importance of family relationships, and the different importance given to work, to leisure, and to the values people strive for.

These rather sketchy remarks are for the purpose of showing how important an objective treatment of your cultural background and that of your new environment is for the understanding of culture shock. There is a great difference in knowing what is the cause of your disturbance and not knowing. Once you realize that your trouble is due to your own lack of understanding of other people's cultural background and your own lack of the means of communication rather than the hostility of an alien environment, you also realize that you yourself can gain this understanding and these means of communication. And the sooner you do this, the sooner culture shock will disappear.

The question now arises, what can you do to get over culture shock as quickly as possible? The answer is to get to know the people of the host country. But this you cannot do with any success without knowing the language, for language is the principal symbol system of communication. Now we all know that learning a new language is difficult, particularly to adults. This task alone is quite enough to cause frustration and anxiety, no matter how skillful language teachers are in making it easy for you. But once you begin to be able to carry on a friendly conversation with your maid, your neighbor, or to go on shopping trips alone, you not only gain confidence and a feeling of power, but a whole new world of cultural meanings opens up for you. You begin to find out what and how people do things and what their interests are. These interests, people usually express by what they habitually talk about and how they allocate their time and money. Once you know this value or interest pattern, it will be quite easy to get people to talk and to be interested in you. When we say people have no interests, we are usually admitting that we have not bothered to find out.

At times it is helpful to be a participant observer by joining the activities of the people, to try to share in their responses, whether this be a carnival, a religious rite, or some economic activity. Yet the visitor should never forget that he or she is an outsider and will be treated as such. He or she should view this participation as role playing. Understanding the ways of people is essential, but this does not mean that you have to give up your own. What happens is that you have developed two patterns of behavior.

Finally, a word on what your fellow countrymen can do to help you get over culture shock. It is well to recognize that persons suffering from culture shock feel weak in the face of conditions which appear insuperable, it is natural for them to try to lean heavily on their compatriots. This may be irritating to the long-term resident, but he should be patient, sympathetic, and understanding. Although talking does not relieve pain, a great deal is gained by having the source of pain explained. Some of the steps toward a cure have been indicated. If we are patient and understanding, we can be reasonably sure that time, the great healer, will soon set things right.

CULTURE SHOCK[1]

Dr. Cora Du Bois[2]

Please do not consider me too irrelevant if I begin talking about an occupational disease among anthropologists. Some twenty years ago I remember first chatting with colleagues about the peculiar emotional status we anthropologists developed when we were working in the field with strange people cut off from our familiar daily surroundings. We all wanted to do field work. We loved it--but we realized that things happened to us when we did. We began calling this peculiar syndrome "culture shock."

Since then I have had the opportunity of observing European colonials in Southeast Asia. Then there was the chance of watching U.S. Army personnel in India and Ceylon. Last year I visited technicians from many parts of the world who were carrying out disease control programs in South Asia for the World Health Organization. And now through IIE there are contacts and reports from foreign visitors to the United States and ECA and Point Four technicians abroad.

We anthropologists flattered ourselves when we thought culture shock was an occupational disease. It is a malady that seems to affect most transplanted people.

The genesis of the malady is really very simple. It is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all your familiar cues. I wonder whether most of us realize how much we depend on a thousand and one cues to remain oriented to the daily situations we find ourselves in? Suppose for example that you couldn't make yourself understood to the taxi driver who brought you here. Suppose you wanted to treat yourself to a good rare steak and restaurants served only rice. Suppose you wanted to spend only fifty dollars for a coat, but not being attuned to dozens of different cues, you walked into Jay Thorpe instead of Gimbels. Suppose you asked a passerby for directions and instead of pointing his finger "in a perfectly natural fashion", he protruded his lower lip and lifted his chin to show you on your way.

There is no use boring you with any more suppositions. The point must certainly be clear. All of us depend for our peace of mind and our efficiency on hundreds of cues, most of which we do not even carry on a level of conscious awareness. These cues are acquired in the course of growing up and are as much part of our cultural heritage as the

---

[1]From To Strengthen World Freedom, Institute of International Education Special Publications Series, No. 1. 2 West 45th Street, New York 19, N. Y.

[2]An address by Dr. Cora Du Bois, Director of Research Institute of International Education, at the Regional Conference in Chicago, November 28, 1951. A noted anthropologist and authority on Southeast Asia, Dr. Du Bois only recently joined the staff of the Institute of International Education to direct the research program. She has been with the Department of State, as Chief of the Southern Areas Branch, Division of Research for the Far East. This past year she was Social Science Consultant at the World Health Organization in Geneva and India. During the war, Dr. Du Bois worked with the Office of Strategic Services in Southern Asia, and in 1945 received the Exceptional Civilian Award from the Department of the Army. In 1949 she also received the Order of the Crown of Thailand for her participation in the Free Thai underground movement through the O.S.S.

Dr. Du Bois has made studies in Indonesia, for the Social Science Research Council, and has worked in Ceylon and India under the auspices of the U.S. Army and the World Health Organization. She is the author of two books: People of Alor, a study of personality and culture among a primitive people of Indonesia, and Social Forces in Southeast Asia.

as the language we speak. They have become so habitual that they have been forgotten as part of our conscious cultural equipment.

Now suddenly remove all, or most, of these cues--and you have a case of culture shock. No matter how tolerant or broad-minded or full of empathy you may be--a series of props have been knocked out from under you, and more or less acute frustrations are likely to result.

People the world over react to frustrations in fairly comparable ways. First they reject, with repressed or expressed aggression, the environment that causes them discomfort. Second they regress with irrational fervor to the familiar and comforting. If you observe a group of Americans--or any other group of nationals--in the throes of culture shock the symptoms are startlingly similar. The slightest inefficiency or delay--particularly variations from our own obsessional time sense--provoke disproportionate anger. All things American acquire new and a sometimes irrational importance. You have all experienced how easy it is to shift from being a "live-and-let-live" patriot to being a chauvinist when you are abroad. You have all observed the tendency of American tourists to cluster together even though they may be spending only a few weeks of their hard-earned vacation to see the English in England or the French in France.

There are other manifestations--the sitting around together in favorite clubs or hotels and grousing about the host country. When you begin hearing broad, and usually derogatory, comments like--the Burmese are lazy; the Indians are ignorant; the French are grasping; the Americans are materialistic, or naive or shallow--then you can be fairly sure the speaker is suffering culture shock. The trouble with this disease is that its symptoms can become chronic. As a result you never do acquire an adequate adjustment to the new environment.

The Foreign Student's "Adjustment to our Culture"

We are here today to discuss the problems of foreign students. It is clear that my semi-facetious remarks about culture shock are not irrelevant. Students and visitors to this country also are bereft of familiar cues, are frustrated and anxious, and tend often to overprize their own familiar background on the one hand; on the other hand they react often with aggressive negativism to much that happens to them here. People of good-will, interested in the foreign visitors to our country, have a big job in seeing to it that the culture shock of our guests does not become a chronic malady. We must be aware of the symptoms--the frustrations that manifest themselves in quick generalizations, in often unreasonable criticisms of this country and in over-valuation of their own country. We must be prepared to understand the emotional adjustments they are making and to help them by taking a genuinely intelligent interest in their own culture to which they may be regressing for assurance. We must give them every opportunity to contribute what they know and prize to the American scene.

In general I would hazard the guess that the greater the difference between the United States and the country from which our guests come, the greater the culture shock will be. The adjustment of Europeans, on the whole, will therefore be easier than that of the Asians. Most of you know of a recent study by Norman Kiell on Indian students in the United States. The study showed a marked decrease in favorable opinion about us after four to forty months in this country. I do not wish to minimize the findings, but I feel that they are not astonishing. Nor are they necessarily evidence of failure on our part. If there has been any failure it may be in not making allowance for such a reaction--particularly after the students had been here long enough to realize that griping is a good old American tradition. In other words, they have learned one set of our culture's cues. They had missed another and more subtle set of cues--that peculiar American need to be loved. They hadn't realized how concerned we become if approval is withdrawn.

Some Disconcerting American Traits

This brings me to the last point I should like to make. International relations--even when only on an interpersonal level--are a complicated affair. If, for example, an American is relating himself to an Indian, it is not just enough for the Indian to know America or for the American to know India. Each person needs to know not only the other, but also himself. It is not easy to be sophisticated about all of these subtle, covert levels that are so taken for granted, so "perfectly natural" in ourselves. We need thoughtful cross-cultural experience and great objectivity to raise to levels or awareness such traits in ourselves. I suspect European experience alone is often inadequate. I wonder, for example, how many Americans who deal with foreign visitors realize that when we settle a difference by compromise, by "splitting the difference," that we may shock certain foreigners by what seems to them our cynical disregard for what is True or Right. This characteristic of compromise, or splitting the difference, is no more disconcerting to some foreign visitors than is our peculiar ambivalence towards figures in authority. In many countries, the rulers are the symbols of national unity. In the United States we encourage men to aspire to positions of high trust, but attack and often attempt to destroy them once they have achieved that status. The very form of our federal government with its system of checks and balances between the legislative, executive and judicial branches, as well as our state versus federal system, reflects all too clearly our distrust of having authority too closely centralized. Yet in many countries, particularly those struggling for national unity, it is precisely this consolidation of authority that seems to them of paramount importance for the establishment of an effective common life in national terms.

Another national trait that is by no means shared by all other people is what Kluckhohn has called the Effort-Optimism syndrome. We believe profoundly that if you work hard, your efforts will be rewarded and all will be for the best in the best of all possible worlds. This is a vast asset to us and the development of the American nation seems to substantiate this belief. I wonder, however, how this effort-optimism syndrome looks to people who have not had a new rich continent to expand in; who value leisure rather than labor; whose social structure does not facilitate upward social mobility; whose national resources and technology in relation to their population growth have not permitted a steadily rising standard of living. To them, our effort-optimism syndrome must seem a very peculiar deviation in the world of social values.

I wonder also what impression our high degree of specialization and yet conformity makes on people who value "the spiritual integration of the whole person." They may appreciate that our highly structured institutions are the source of our material strength and recognize that these institutions reflect our managerial skills. The foreign guest may appreciate that we have developed a capacity for spontaneous cooperation that has performed an almost miraculous job of welding together a great continent and diverse peoples into a nation that has trouble maintaining two fundamentally different political parties; that wears the same clothes and chews the same gum from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The foreign guest may well be puzzled by the peculiar combination of almost boring conformity we have achieved at the same time that we have developed specialization of functions to a degree probably unparalleled in human history. This I submit is an anomaly of American life--an anomaly that may well puzzle the foreign visitor. He may find that the personalities that have been shaped by such an anomaly singularly baffling--and to him lacking in personal depth, integration, and individuation.

Helping Others Understand Us

We cannot and should not want to be anything but ourselves. But we do have the obligation of assisting others to understand us so long as we bring them here in ever growing numbers.

I have been vastly encouraged at the interest and insights that leaders of American life have shown in the last six years about foreign peoples and unfamiliar cultures. There is still a large job to be done on that front both in terms of basic research and the translation of that research into useful operational terms. But the next frontier that we need now to explore, objectively and scientifically, is the inner and covert coherence and values of American culture. Until this element is included we are dealing with an incomplete equation.

CULTURE AS AN INVISIBLE PRISON

By Jerry Leach*

Americans are bewildering creatures in the eyes of a Turk. The reasons for this are cultural, and highly interesting. As children we pick up through unconscious imitation of adults most of the "rules" governing interpersonal relations in our culture. These built-in behavioral patterns are so taken for granted that we are not aware of their existence. When they are not followed, we sense uncomfortably that something is not as it should be.

Take, for example, the response of an American airman to a long-haired hitchhiker in Ankara. "I don't know why," he said, "but I just want to bust one of those guys in the nose." Here a tough type, accustomed to physical solutions to his problems, felt unsettled and threatened by something that couldn't be more harmless, another person's hair. Why? Because one of the most fundamental "rules" of social life in our society had been broken. One of the basic signals by which we make concrete and visible the differentiation of the sexes had been confused. Such signals are the means by which we provide order in our interpersonal relations. Confusion, then, unconsciously threatens the very foundations of social order.

Our reactions to this kind of situation are widely varied. Three common types of responses are admonition or punishment of the offender, the demanding of an explanation or, most often among peers, gossip.

Some conspicuous categories of these cultural "rules" or signal systems are: how to dress for all roles and occasions, how to eat acceptably, whom to joke with, whom to be respectful of, what places one can or can't go to, what subjects to talk about with what kinds of people, and even what vocabulary to use. These are just to mention a few. Turks naturally have such "rules" too. Theirs are most often <u>quite</u> different from ours. The similarities between our cultural patterns and theirs are, in my opinion, superficial. Their system, though, like ours, has an internal consistency of its own. It is the clashing of two divergent behavioral systems that causes each side to view the other as "bewildering" "unreasonable" or "uninhibited."

The wide divergence between Turkish and American patterns of behavior, belief and value is a definite liability in Peace Corps work. This liability is one that will not be overcome by a naive belief in "good will" although that belief will help. The crucial question is attitude. One must adopt a way of looking at things that seeks explanation for everything that's happening cross-culturally. For the American side of things, this amounts to introspection that seeks to find the silent signals and hidden order in the American system. In relation to the Turkish side, this amounts to observation and an attempt to discover the internal logic in the Turkish system. This is not an easy process. In fact, American college graduates, in spite of their education, are not very well prepared for it. Those who do develop this approach, I think, find Turkey an easier place to live in.

I wasn't a good example of the approach I've outlined here. Not a single day passed without my painfully experiencing some Turk's violating the "natural and logical" way of doing things. At first it was staring, then it was abrupt "no" answers and arrogance from petty officialdom. Later it was shattering horns, and still later continual

---

*Jerry Leach and his wife, Marianne, taught English as Volunteers in Turkey for two years. He is now engaged in graduate work in social anthropology at Berkeley. The article was published in <u>The Volunteer</u>, May, p. 7.

interruptions while talking. Each little violation of our "natural" way brought irritation, sometimes anger. Rapidly these irritations built up to an explosiveness that was too easily provoked. This latent tension marred my stay in Turkey. Surprisingly, despite my awareness in the abstract of cross-cultural problems and differences, I found my reactions to these differences hostile. Intellectual perception was not enough to neutralize the unpleasant emotional reaction that accompanied not doing something "my" way. In other words, the responses that I had learned to thousands of situational stimuli placed me in a kind of invisible prison. I learned how to open the doors in these invisible walls only through trial and error.

The Peace Corps then should re-think the tacit and absurd assumption that Volunteers know enough about their own culture to enter into the delicate process of analyzing, understanding and operating within another. The throw-them-in-the-water-and-let-them-learn-to-swim attitude leaves the Volunteer weakest where he needs his greatest strength--in dealing with Turks face to face. This visual attitude results eventually in the death of many good intentions and good ideas among Volunteers. The learn-by-error process is not completely necessary. The naive belief in "good will" is, in fact, harmful. Volunteers could benefit greatly from a training program that analyzed in detail what happens and why in both Turkish and American cultures. Although this approach is no panacea it would present the basic tools for dealing with Turkish society.

Stop, Look, Listen

Turning to cross-cultural trouble spots, I first think of transportation. Riding in urban Turkey can be nerveracking. I did enjoy it more, though, when I discovered that there was some order more refined than survival of the fittest. Observation of the internal workings of the pattern of driving became, indeed, fascinating. I gradually realized that city driving was not producing the number of accidents that I thought it deserved. Things fell into place when someone tipped me off to the deceptively simple, unconscious system that the poorly educated, uncitified Turkish driver has devised. The rule is to watch out for the guy ahead. The driver's job is to guard against and dodge anything that the fellow in front might do. Looking back, signalling, and looking in all directions before entering traffic are anathema to the system. The foreign drivers who do such things actually gum up the impatient split-second timing of the process. Without knowing this, what we incorrectly experience in Turkish traffic is something like the every-man-for-himself situation in amusement-park crash cars.

Bodily contact involves an interesting cross-cultural danger spot. In our society touching another person is in most situations taboo. In Turkey, though, a full bus pushes people into atom-spliting embrace, and no one really seems to mind. In addition, some social situations require bodily contact between members of the same sex as a sign of friendship. This entails being held by the elbow, interlocking arms while walking, kissing on both cheeks, walking shoulder-to-shoulder, being kissed on the hand, talking at unnaturally close range (a kind of psychic contact for us), or occasionally holding little fingers. Our reflex is to pull away in shock from such advances. The Turk sees such withdrawal as cold or superior. This is, I think, an excellent example of how cross-cultural problems can arise from a lack of awareness of one's own behavioral patterns.

Cues On Queuing

Closely allied to the problem of physical contact is the business of ranking patterns in lines or crowds. Ankara is gradually learning to give some order in entering buses. Conscious lining up, though, is still a rather unnatural cultural graft and rapidly breaks down without an attendant. This is particularly true when seats are scarce. In unqueued situations, for example a bus stop, Americans uncomfortably experience pushing and cutting in. Our built-in ranking pattern gives priority according to closeness to the door. Breaking the pattern by barging ahead is rude and irritating. Turks observe no such rule up to the point of one person's pushing much harder than others. Reaction even to this might be only a curt word of admonition from a well-dressed man.

Ranking problems occur also in business relationships. In receiving attention as a

customer, Americans expect service on the "first come, first served" basis. This reflects our egalitarian attitudes toward other individuals in impersonal situations. The order of arrival in a restaurant, post office, or sidewalk cafe determines the order of service. This applies in Turkey as well until two or more people of clearly different status simultaneously seek service. At such a time status considerations, particularly age and apparent affluence, become the determining factor. This causes occasional service "out of turn" to our way of thinking.

Time is another source of conflicting cultural signals. In urban America five minutes is the basic unit of meaning in time. Five, ten, fifteen, thirty and forty-five minute waiting periods evoke rapidly increasing irritation. In Ankara waiting is not uncommon in both friendly and formal situations. Turkish time is built on considerably longer meaningful units. Waiting thirty to sixty minutes for a well-placed official is normal and should not be considered insulting. Such treatment is common for all. Highly valued time is, after all, a by-product of industrial society.

Notice that all these danger zones--riding, touching, crowding, ranking and waiting--pertain primarily to dealing with <u>anonymous</u> Turks. Like all cities, Ankara conducts most of its daily business impersonally. This means that the Volunteer must relate to hundreds of people whom he may see only once or, at most, exchange a few sentences with on occasions. I contend that most of the problems of getting along in Ankara lie with this group, the anonymous Turks.

Why is this? The answer seems to involve three reasons. First, business is not so consumer-oriented that the customer's good opinion or continued patronage are valued as high up the scale as in our culture. Consequently, the customer is not always right, or even catered to. Business relations in most of Turkey can, in fact, be viewed best as the reverse of ours. In principle the dealer controls scarce resources which the buyers must compete for. The dealer then dispenses his goods or services to those who win his favor. Arguments often result between Volunteers and waiters, taxi drivers, post office clerks, landlords and butchers because Volunteers unthinkingly follow the American pattern of business relations. Naturally assuming their dominance, Volunteers expect and demand services over and above what the dealers customarily give. The fantasy that Turks are "out to cheat the foreigner" often results from this.

Second, impersonality removes the Turk from the key restraining influence on his social behavior, neighborhood and family opinion. He no longer has to defend his conduct before the all-powerful tribunal of gossip; therefore he doesn't pay the usual social penalties for a wrong act. Third, their type of impersonality is just different from ours, yet we treat it as if it were the same. Our failure lies in not analyzing it and not learning to act on <u>its</u> principles. It is surprising how many Volunteers unknowingly demand that Turks act like Americans.

The distinction between the anonymous Turk and the "known" one is, I think, a useful analytical tool for making sense of cross-cultural trouble spots. Away from anonymous Turks, the Volunteer can expect "good will" to be his most valuable asset.

<u>A Field of Study</u>

A completely different kind of danger zone is closely related to impersonal relations and the opinion that living in Ankara is not a "real Peace Corps experience." Turkey's capital is admittedly a big, fast, busy city. It unquestionably cannot offer urbanized Americans a radically different <u>physical</u> environment and challenge. The Volunteer who wants primarily that from the Peace Corps should be in rural Turkey. But for every Volunteer not so definite about one goal, any Turkish city offers an exciting, challenging and radically different <u>psychological</u> experience.

My point is that every Ankara Volunteer must attack his environment first as a <u>field of investigation</u> and second as a <u>field of work.</u> Village Volunteers do this by contacting people and "getting around" during their first months in a site. Only through the

first step, investigation, can one properly define and approach the second, work. Approaching one's term of service in this way should lead to a much clearer idea of the limitations and possibilities of effecting change in the work environment. The careful selection of one's battlefields is absolutely essential. The natural reflex is to resist everything about Turkish society that one doesn't agree with or to give up in cynicism. Indiscriminate resistance dangerously undercuts one's acceptance into the work group. In other words, most of what one doesn't like just has to be accepted. Only in this way can one hope for results in the important areas that one chooses to attack.

No 'Welcome Wagon'

How then does one approach Ankara as a field of investigation? Fundamentally this means adopting the mental framework toward cross-cultural relations that was suggested earlier. Next comes actually establishing a range of social contacts. Here many problems lie in making American assumptions on how the newcomer gets into community life. Broadly speaking, in American society the responsibility of getting new members into the community lies mainly with the community itself. The ice-breaking of introductions, visits and social invitations tends to flow from community to newcomer. Similarly, the Volunteer in small-town Turkey often finds Turkish culture streaming irrepressibly into his living room. However, Turkish culture does not stream into an Ankara living room. The volunteer must seek it. The faltering point is that many Volunteers are not aware of the subtle role change from passive receiver to active seeker that Ankara necessitates. Without this awareness it would be easy to live a Peace Corps term of service in Ankara and never develop a circle of Turkish friends.

"Seeking" friends subtly crosses the boundary of acceptability in American culture. We regard pushy attempts at making friends as ungenuine. Such reserve may unnecessarily impede Volunteers from initiating contacts across the culture barrier. Two other causes for holding back deserve mention. The first is Turkish, and it does undoubtedly take considerable resolve to break the ice with people when one is struggling with the language. The second is that meeting new Turks can easily be stiff and formal because Turks have a rather rigid mode of formal behavior. But a rich variety of cross-cultural experience can only come through Turkish contacts, so one must, in Ankara at least, play the role of active seeker.

What does one do then to integrate himself into Turkish society? The obvious starting point is one's job group. Within it one would naturally start with the younger set. Breaking the ice should begin immediately upon arrival. Introductions and the usual amenities are the beginning. Conversation should follow whenever convenient. Reading or cliquishly grouping up with other Volunteers during rest breaks are anathema to the process. Turks regard one wrapped up in a book as aloof and disinterested. They see him as bored and unhappy with his situation. Reading has a cultural interpretation to Turks that is strikingly different from ours, and it can be a negative factor in one's efforts to "break in." If one strikes mutual ground with a colleague or two, the next step lies again with the Volunteer. The possibilities at this point are an invitation to a movie, meeting at one of the popular sidewalk cafes, having an evening together at the Volunteer's apartment, or an invitation to supper. (It goes without saying that males invite males and females invite females.) Waiting for invitations was 100 per cent unsuccessful in my case.

Initial rapport with two or three interested Turks has a wavelike effect. New opportunities are always arising with friends of friends. One word of caution, though. Many contacts don't work. In fact, expectations of finding sparkling personalities our style in even every tenth skin are unfounded.

These suggestions presuppose that there is a younger set in your job group. If there isn't, the obvious point of departure is the older group. Approaching them is expectedly slower and more formal. Invitations in most cases would be out of place. In this situation, visiting, I think, is the answer. Going to their house first is an excellent start. It is, indeed, a very high compliment in Turkish eyes. The response is likely to be an

invitation to a tea. Here again the multiplier effect of friends meeting more friends goes into action. Volunteers have been flagrant about not going to teas. They are often boring, it's true, but they are the Turk's primary institution of polite behavior. If viewed as a laboratory for studying the formal Turk, their customs and conversation can be surprisingly revealing. When one is being complimented by a tea invitation, failure to attend is not likely to be forgotten by the host.

Loners, Please

The next question might naturally be what happens when job contacts don't work. Since friendships are struck most easily between contemporaries, a Volunteer would turn to Turks between 20 and 30 years old. Most of them would be older university students. Several suggestions for meeting some of them are: going to an evening lecture or an open forum, getting help in looking up something in a library, or patronizing one of the sidewalk cafes downtown. (I found this last approach successful.) Asking for help on a point in Turkish is a golden lead for conversation. Two words of caution here: first, only males can use these techniques, and second, do this sort of thing by yourself. Travelling with a group of Volunteers is the kiss of death in meeting Turks.

In closing, let me return briefly to my distinction between the anonymous and the known Turks. If my thesis is correct--that anonymous Turks create the really troublesome areas of interpersonal relations--then one would want to turn anonymous contacts as much as possible into known ones. One can do this to a limited extent by regularly patronizing a favorite waiter, hairdresser, barber, taxi driver, grocer or copper dealer. This involves striking up a friendly conversation, sometimes drinking tea together, and dropping by occasionally to say hello. With this approach satisfactory business relationships are much more likely than when one deals at random. Cross-class social contacts, hard to come by anywhere, are again much more possible when one deals through regular patronage.

In summary, Volunteers in Ankara are victims of their own unthinking assumptions about social behavior. The best defense against this that I can see is the adoption of the attitude of the observer. The observer seeks foremost to discover the principles of social behavior and the value system that they rest upon. For any Volunteer this means that explanation is his first job and change his second.

RETURN TO LAUGHTER*

Elenore Smith Bowen

"Redwoman! Ikpoom!" Accident was gleeful. He had something to tell us, so funny that he didn't even notice Lucia and quite forgot his usual respect for his elders. Accident could hardly stop laughing long enough to speak, but he would not let us get in one word. We knew Ngun? That old, old man who was blind and had no children to lead him about? Surely I had seen him feeling his way along the path, testing the ruts with his bare feet, poking from side to side with his stick. I nodded. Ngun was a nice old man who bore his blindness bravely, but he was without wit or humor. I couldn't imagine any funny story concerning Ngun.

"Well," Accident told his story with zest, "I was out hunting birds with my slingshot, and I met him. He was all alone, shuffling along because the path was so slippery with mud. He was about to fall anyhow. So I yelled, 'Watch out, Ngun. A snake!'" Accident hugged himself with mirth, and Ikpoom howled with laughter. Only Lucia and I didn't get the point.

"Well," I prompted. "Go on. Tell me what was funny."

Ikpoom, still forgetting that I was in disgrace, gave me the explanation, his usually monotonous voice lively with amusement. "Ngun is blind. He can't see. He wouldn't know which way to jump." He began to laugh again. "There's nothing funnier than yelling 'Snake!' at a blind man."

"Funny!" I looked at Ikpoom as though I were seeing him for the first time.

"Yes," Accident put in. "He can't know where it is."

Ikpoom saw that I was not amused. He was a sensitive man and a kind one; he thought he knew what disturbed me, and he tried to set my mind at rest. "If there's really a snake there, you mean to tell him where it is. Only people get so excited when they see snakes that they don't remember. They just yell. So of course a blind man can't be sure."

They were both laughing. I looked at them, at Accident's glee, at Ikpoom's gargoyle grin, at mad Lucia singing and hoeing away at the bare earth, throwing pebbles behind her like weeds. Were these the people whose approval I had wanted? to whom I had almost been ready to submit my conduct for judgment? I looked back again at the man and the boy.

Accident pointed the joke. "He keeps poking about with his stick."

"He's afraid to move and afraid to stand still," Ikpoom hooted at the picture, "and he doesn't know which way to jump."

"Quite." My voice was as cold as my heart, and, as always seemed to happen here when I was deeply upset, I spoke English. "Quite. Typical peasant humor, but I am not a peasant and you are a bunch of savages."

They looked at me, puzzled by my tone. "What is it?" Ikpoom was concerned.

---

*(From the anthropological novel Return to Laughter, published by Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1964. pp. 227-231 & 259-261.) Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

"Don't you know the words?" Accident groped for my trouble.

I looked at them across a gulf I didn't really care to cross. "Perhaps it is the words." I had to say something. It was just the way they were. It was no use being angry with them. It was just seeing what they were. . .and knowing what I had almost done that had made me almost sick in revulsion. "I will get my paper." They were still friendly. That was what I had wanted. I didn't want it right now, but why spoil it? I went into my hut, but not to get my notebook.

"There is nothing funnier than making a blind man jump"--in fear and to avoid a danger he could not locate. Just then, their laughter was a symbol. A symbol of everything that has held me silent and disgusted before those of my own country who laugh crudely and maliciously at the pain of others. The little boys who tie tin cans to dogs. The hearty hulks who play cruel practical jokes. The fine pincers of malice exposing pain to the laughter of a callous world.

I could never have laughed with Accident and Ikpoom at such a story, but it was only because I heard it when I did that I was so nearly sick over it. My revulsion was within and against myself, because I had forgotten who they were and who I was, because I had come so close to begging their liking at the price of my convictions.

Ikpoom was a good man by nature, but he was a savage. They were all savages. For the first time I applied the word to them in my own thinking. And it fit. What could I want with them? What could they offer save poverty of life and of spirit? Taking from the earth a bare sufficienty for the year,they gorged themselves at harvest and then went hungry. Wasteful, improvident savages. Why should I hope to find anything of personal value to me among them? One does not seek wisdom among men who live and sleep so close to the earth, the very vermin their superiors.

Slowly the grim facts of their environment crept back into my memory. The mold and mildew that rot the stored grain. The termites and boring insects that honeycomb the walls and eat through the roof supports. The deadly diseases that lie like a miasma over the hot earth: malaria, sleeping sickness, yaws, leprosy--an hour's rosary of killing and maiming diseases. Improvement? Callous? What else could they be.

It was not just to blame them, but I could no longer be charmed by them. The lush vegetation covered a harsh ground; the vinedraped groves by the streams were haunts of disease and poisonous fungi. Nature had given this land a warm beauty to cover its cold, selfish indifference to the struggles of those who lived on it. Man is not nice about means of survival. The land could fascinate, but in that fascination there could be little affection. The people seemed to me as the land. At first acquaintance they had laughter, a proud bearing, and a grace of speech and movement. Underneath? Whether it was their nature or their circumstances, today they seemed harsh and cruel.

With a new appreciation I thought of my own life, of my country and our civilization. I had learned there to appreciate the riches of comfort and learning, the wealth of beauty of sight and sound that surround us from our birth. Secure in our heritage we are often blind to it. Surrounded by so much, we are often too lazy to stretch out our hands for even the nearest. I had come here from a life so fabulous that this new language I had learned had no words to speak it in.

I had come from one world to live in another. These two worlds judged by standards so greatly different that translation was often impossible. Partly for this reason, partly because of my job, I had often seemed to agree where I did not. One cannot do field work by saying, "Of course, it is impossible for a man, allegedly a witch, to turn himself into an animal; by what fiction do you account for his retransformation?" The mere suspicion that his beliefs are ridiculed will silence a man permanently. Now I had to show myself to them as a liar and a hypocrite or abide by what they knew I

understood and thought I approved and believed. I had been right, last night, to resolve to break through my enforced isolation. But I could not do so by giving in to them.

I stood up, to shake myself free of indecision. Their laughter at suffering was merely one symbol of the gulf between their world and mine. Today, for the first time, I began to realize that our kindness to the crippled and unfortunate is a luxury born of our ability to spare help and resources. But that luxury has become a moral obligation. I must not abandon it. I had known that where existence is precarious, the weak go under. But I found it horrible that those who were safe should laught at the sight. Even if they knew they too might perish on the morrow, even then, especially then, should they not rather pity than laugh? Where people laughed at human misery, our doctrine of kindness to animals, for the sake of mere kindness without intent to use or worship, seemed the wildest extravagance. They would accept, I thought, the notion that a god would mark the fall of a sparrow--but with a hunter's eye, for I did not think they could imagine any being free of the fear of hunger.....

* * * *

One day Kako came to tell me that a skilled "cutter" had come to circumcise all the boys in the homestead. I nerved myself to witness, and tried to drum up some enthusiasm by telling myself I was lucky to have the chance. In a tribe where there are no bush schools, no regular circumcision ceremonies, only a conviction that men must be circumcised before they had anything to do with women, an opportunity to see the thing done and make sure that what they had told me was so could only happen by chance. Still, I didn't relish it.

However, Accident, who was among those to be operated on, was almost exuberant at the prospect. "Then I shall be a man," he told me proudly. With all the energy of his eight years he ran round and round the homestead with a boasting shout, "After tomorrow let all women beware of me. Oi! But I shall be a man indeed!"

We met early the next morning--blood, like oil, congeals in the chill of the morning; no one would perform such an operation at noon when the blood flows freely. We all watched Kako manipulate ritual symbols as he ceremonially removed all magical danger from the fourteen boys. If all magical precautions were taken and witches were successfully warded off, there could be no danger in the operation.

Men, women and children gathered around to watch and hearten the lads. Myself pale and shaken from mere watching, I paid full tribute to the endurance they showed. Most of the boys bit their lips in silence; any stifled moan that escaped them was drowned in the shouted encouragement of the by-standers: "Have courage!" "Strengthen your heart!" "Now you are a man!" A few, like Accident, managed to gasp out faint bawdiness, "Whittle carefully there. Many women shall judge your work!" No matter how feeble the jest, such sallies were greeted with great applause. "Our little brother has a stong heart." "He who jokes under the knife will not fear lions."

Their courage put me to shame. My stomach, queasy and rebellious, shoved my heart into my throat. Vividly, almost blotting out the sight before me, I saw the old English prints: the patient strapped to the operating table, the solicitous relatives, the grim surgeon, the bottle that was the only sheld against the shock of pain. I couldn't have taken it. My knees shook. This could be done at the hospital. Such pain was unnecessary. Accident had proved his courage. My father's voice rose out of the past: "Grin and bear it." Learn to laugh on the gallows. But why stand on the gallows? Accident's mother had watched, apparently unmoved. "It is nothing my son." But her knees were shaking too.

No, it was not callousness. Not exactly. Not the callousness of a single heart, but the callousness of a whole culture, a protection against the pain that had to be borne. Like their bare, horny feet, I couldn't walk where they did. Taking advantage of a man's blindness to make him jump was part of it. Laugh at the man on the gallows, for

you may stand there tomorrow. I was used to shoes and anesthetics, had a thin skin and thin nerves and feared cruel laughter.

The smallest boy, only three, was screaming his heart out. Beside me his mother turned away, held on to me. "He is not old enough. He doesn't know. He can't understand. He does not know it must be. How, then, can he jest? How can he be brave?"

What must be, can be endured. Of all the people there, only I knew it didn't have to be. They had not learned to cry in their anguish, "This must not be! Surely there must be a way!" That rebellious cry had encouraged us to find a way. I had been used to mock at visionaries and reformers. Face to face with the alternative, I was humbled. I myself was not one who cried, "There must be a way." I had never seen the need, for I had been born to a pleasant world. But here--where people said, "It must be as it is. It must be endured": where their only solution was "Grin and bear it," where I could not say, "This is the best of all possible worlds"--here I was forced to consider the possibility that even my world might be improved. I banished the thought. I had grown fearful of the constant temptation to question my own values that these people and this world afforded me.

* * * *

Excerpts from

ASPECTS OF AMERICAN CULTURE: ASSUMPTIONS AND VALUES THAT AFFECT CROSS-CULTURAL EFFECTIVENESS

By

Edward C. Stewart

American advisors overseas frequently have difficulties in communicating and cooperating with their counterparts. The obstacles to cross-cultural understanding may be conceptualized as differences in cultural assumptions and values. From the American's point of view, his own values and assumptions prevent him from objectively perceiving and understanding the underpinnings of the behavior of his counterpart. His performance overseas would be enhanced if he understood both his own culture and that of his counterpart.

Although a cultural pattern is an integrated whole, it may be analyzed into five components: perception of the self and the individual, perception of the world, motivation, form of relation to others, and form of activity. American culture was analyzed according to these five components, with attention frequently drawn to contrasting examples from other cultures.

The emphasis on American culture as well as on contrasting cultures advocated in this report is intended to achieve four objectives.

1. Establish Conceptual Cross-Cultural Bridges. The terms used in describing American culture should serve as bridges to other cultures. Although some of the values which have been discussed in this report cannot be literally translated into other cultures, all cultures will contain assumptions, values, and norms of behavior which can be classified somewhere within the scheme provided.

2. Induce an Attitude of Cultural Relevance. A cultural characteristic represents only one of a number of possible assumptions, values, or norms of behavior. Other alternatives will be found in the same culture, and in a different culture, the same alternatives, but with a different emphasis. Thus the American way may not necessarily be the most desirable, and certainly not the normal or natural way, in a given cultural context.

3. Facilitate Self Understanding. An awareness of American culture along with contrasting examples ought to induce understanding by the individual of himself as a cultural being. He ought to be better prepared for the hardships of cultural shock and frustrations common to overseas missions. He ought to be more objective in his self-appraisal as well as the evaluation of his counterparts. In particular, he ought to be better prepared to separate cultural factors from idiosyncratic ones in himself and in his counterparts.

4. Identify Facilitating and Interfering Factors. The individual should be better able to identify those specific American predispositions that usually facilitate his work abroad, as well as those that usually handicap him.

The attainment of the four objectives above ought to lead to a more objective advisor who is capable of making the necessary observations about himself and his counterpart. His cross-cultural understanding, of himself and of the counterparts, should place him in the advantageous position of adapting his American purposes to the most promising form for the local situation. Thus, he should be able to develop guides for his own behavior, recasting desirable goals overseas by means of the art of the possible into realistic activities.

Assumptions and Values

The typical person has a strong sense of what the world is really like, so that it is with surprise that he discovers that "reality" is built up out of certain assumptions commonly shared among members of the same culture. Members of other cultures will hold to a different idea of reality since they make different assumptions about the world and their experience in it. Most Americans, for instance, implicitly assume that the world external to themselves and others is physical, material, and does not have a soul or a spirit. The truth of the assumptions may appear to be self-evident, but, in fact, they are not shared by many peoples throughout the non-Western world. Large segments of the peoples throughout South and Southeast Asia endow nature with an essence similar to the one reserved for man by Westerners. It is this assumption which, in part, predisposes Westerners and Americans in particular to exploit the physical environment to their own purposes. Conversely, the Indian or the Southeast Asian finds himself attempting to synthesize or integrate with nature because he assumes that this is the relationship naturally existing. Man is just another form of life and does not possess unique attributes which set him apart from other forms, or even from topographical features of the environment such as a mountain or a valley.

Cultural assumptions may be defined as abstract, organized, and general concepts which pervade a person's outlook and behavior. These same properties of assumptions are not characteristic of behavior, which is concrete, discrete, and specific.

Basic assumptions such as the perception of the self, and the perception of the world, can be inferred from actions of an individual; however, several are usually required to cover fully any particular behavior. Furthermore, these basic perceptions do not inevitably fix the direction in which an individual acts. For example, the middle class American usually thinks of himself as an individual, the world as inanimate, success as his goal, impersonal cooperation with others as desirable, and doing as his preferred activity. Do these assumptions mean that he should become a business man, or a social worker? Should he take an active part in local politics, or does he confine his political activity to the voting booth? Does he engage in discussion by outlining the main issues before proceeding to details and applications, or does he follow the reverse direction? All of these questions are related to the basic assumptions of the individual and reflect the cultural pattern of American middle class society. They do not, however, directly govern the actions of the individual. Most decisions, actions, and evaluations are considered according to concepts less abstract, less generalized and less organized than the cultural assumptions. For example, most Americans assume that nature is material and exploitable, and this assumption is related to the fact that Americans usually desire material comfort and possessions. People should have shelter, clothing, warmth, and all of the other means that make the individual materially comfortable. It is also desirable and acceptable that the individual have his own car, house and other physical possessions. If an American were to give away all of his possessions, deny himself material comforts, and choose to dress in rags while wandering in the pursuit of spiritual grace, his actions would be more in keeping with the cultural patterns of parts of Asia. In the United States, the individual's behavior would probably be considered as a deviation from the pursuit of material comfort and possessions. Whatever reasons the individual might advance for pursuing the Biblical road to salvation would usually be considered eccentric, for most Americans do not recognize incompatibility between the goal of acquiring material comfort and possessions, and that of leading a good life.

Although everyone knows Americans who are not particularly concerned with physical comfort, it is apparent that material comfort is the dominant pattern when one notes the time, effort, and money expended by Americans on labor-saving devices, comfortable means of transportation, etc. In India, on the other hand, the stress on spiritual grace rather than on material comfort is readily observed. The fundamental difference between the two cultures (or any cultures) is the difference in the stress given each possible set of assumptions and actions.

The distinction between common sense values, and cultural assumptions and values, deserves emphasis. Americans are aware of their own common sense values and readily use

them to describe their own actions. Members of a culture, however, are not necessarily aware of the assumptions and values which systematically describe their behavior. These are inferences made by the social scientist, about which the individual does not have to be articulate. The only requirement is that the behavior of the individual be describable according to the assumptions and values. As a matter of fact, awareness of the cultural underpinnings of behavior ranges from the very explicit to the implicit. The assumptions in particular are not likely to be acknowledged by members of a culture. Being fundamental to the individual's outlook, they are likely to be considered as a part of the real world and therefore remain unquestioned.

Behavioral Prescriptions

In this discussion of assumptions and values, it is appropriate to ask whether there is not some way in which the complexities of these concepts can be avoided. Why not furnish the American going abroad with a list of do's and don'ts? Tell him never to point his feet at a person when in Thailand; don't pat a child on the head in Laos; always use polite and flowery expressions in speaking; do not expect punctuality, and do not be insulted to find it missing in others. In short it should be possible to draw up a list of behaviors ranging from those that are desirable to those that are taboo. This approach, however, is not commendable for several reasons.

1. In most instances, the American advisor arriving overseas can easily observe or ask about those obvious actions that are either desirable or taboo.

2. Mastery of these come far short of equipping the American for an effective interaction with his counterparts.

3. Furthermore, in attempting to define effective performance in terms of desirable and taboo actions, we endow behavior with misleading objectivity. Behavior is ambiguous: the same action may have different meanings in different situations, so that it is impossible to give a behavioral description of what the advisor should do overseas until it is possible to define both the other people and the situation. Our state of knowledge of human behavior and, in particular, of the overseas situation, does not allow us to accomplish either of the two objectives.

4. There is one final objection to describing the American's desired actions overseas simply as behavior.* The effective advisor or innovator should not act as an American, nor should he become indistinguishable from his counterparts. To go native is neither possible nor desirable. He should adopt a third culture,** (Useem et al.) that of advisors or innovators, which cannot be derived from lists of desirable and taboo behaviors in the duty country. The best tactic for furnishing guidance to Americans working overseas is to strive for cross-cultural understanding. The first step in doing this is to describe the assumptions and values which the advisor demonstrates as an American. This will be attempted in a manner aimed at allowing the American to determine the cultural background of those with whom he works overseas and to compare it with his own.

---

*See Kunkel 1965, for the behavioristic position in the area of innovation.

**Editor's note. This is a point made often in the responses from the field to our cross-cultural questionnaire. The volunteer abroad should learn how to accommodate the host culture in his behavior. This does not mean losing his American characteristics (he neither should nor could), but developing a sensitivity to both cultures and the facility to combine understanding of the two in his work. Good host-country innovators work from the same middle ground between the modern and the traditional patterns of behavior.

Following are examples from Stewart's Aspects:

General Perception of the Self (Individual)

The concept of the individual self is an integral assumption of American culture, so deeply ingrained that Americans ordinarily do not question it. They naturally assume that each person has his own separate identity which should be recognized and stressed. Since this cultural assumption is implicit and outside of the awareness of Americans, the nature of the self-identity is somewhat elusive. By comparing the "who-am-I" concept across cultures, however, it is found that Americans perceive themselves in the broad terms of a human being of a particular sex. When a more specific identity is given, it is likely to be in terms of a social role (e.g., husband), identification with one's own generation [teen-ager, middle-aged], and the achievements of the individual. This general perception of the self allows the American considerable freedom of choice in his actions--in contrast to narrower self-definitions of individuals from other cultures, which may include such considerations as caste, religion, rank, or class. Any one of these may take precedence over the more general factors Americans use to define identity. The self may be given an overly-narrow definition by occupation (professor, soldier) or by family (a Smith, a Dunlap), or the primary consideration in defining the self may be locale or ethnic group (a village, a particular tribe). The narrower the perception of the self, the more precisely delineated will be the types of contact the individual will have with others, including people from other nations. His social interactions will seem to be set and unchanging, while his ability to be practical in choosing courses of action will seem limited.

The Self (Individual) as a Point of Reference

The self perception in American culture is important in a different way: it is used as a point of reference to make ideas and concepts more meaningful. The concepts of dignity and human nature, which are so important to Latins, for instance, become literary and imprecise ideas in the United States. They are at a level of abstraction too uncomfortable for Americans to employ them as everyday concepts. If they are used at all, they are more likely to be rendered as self-respect, needs, and goals. In each instance a more concrete and self-referring term is used, since Americans are usually apologetic when they refer to concepts that do not have a clear reference to the individual as a reference point.

The American stress on the individual as a concrete point of reference begins at a very early age when the American child is encouraged to be autonomous. The self-centeredness of the child is seldom questioned. It is implicitly accepted that each child, or person, should be encouraged to decide for himself, develop his own opinions, solve his own problems, have his own things, [do his own thing], and in general learn to view the world from the point of view of the self. The American is not expected to bow to the wishes of authority, be it vested in family, traditions, or some organization. This untrammeled freedom of choice and self-autonomy does not exist in a social vacuum. Social control, and even a form of social coercion, is found in the nebulous but imperative expectation that the individual will choose as everyone else wants him to. As F. Kluckhohn has put it, the individual is "'free to be like everyone else.'" (F. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck 1961). Thus the stress on the individual as a concrete point of reference is consummated in the value of individualism.

The pressures on the individual are usually informal, since he is assumed to be a free agent. If he conforms to the pressures from his group, family, or associates, he belongs; if he chooses to deviate from the norms expected of him, then he runs against the American intolerance of "rate-busters," "non-conformists," ["beatniks"], etc. He fails to receive the fruits of approval, esteem, and popularity, strong under-currents in American culture.* One observer has gone as far as to say that success in American life is rarely an end in itself. It is pursued for

---

*The beatnik or hippy, of course, usually gains social acceptance and approval from his peers.

> ...social acceptance, not for pleasure or power, but for admiration, love, and even self-respect. (Kaplan 1958)

Distastes for Systems of Thought

There is little precedent in American culture for developing a system of values which resolves the internal contradiction in the assumption of the self and the value of freedom. Coherent personal philosophies and systematic ideologies are both exceptionally rare in American culture. Values are given specific applications and their contradictions are ignored or rationalized. An important contradiction to the dominant American value has been the inequalities extended the Negro. Discrimination has at times been "justified" on the denial of Negro humanness or, in some cases, equal evolutionary development. Such a position furnished justification for discrimination, while maintaining the value that all men are equal. A more sophisticated rationalization, with tinges of both politics and logic, was the "separate but equal" tenet, which for many decades provided the basis for segregation. At a more personal level, many whites often had a tendency to act as if the Negro just did not exist.

A similar reluctance to spawn an ideology or a philosophy exists at a more strictly political level in the United States. Thus Americans are likely to ignore or deny the implications for free enterprise and the individual of social security, TVA, GI Bill of Rights, minimum wage law, and governmental assistance to agriculture and to the airlines. Each one of these practices, and others with similar implications, has to be fought out on its own terms, since TVA does not establish a precedent for the development of the Columbia River basin, and social security does not predispose to Medicare. These are somewhat general statements requiring considerable reservations. But they do indicate one deeply imbued cultural value: the American resists systems of thought which lose sight of the individual. The many elements of governmental responsibility and care for the individual are not usually unified into a system of ideology. (See Perry, 1949) Americans typically cling to the ideal of individual enterprise, a belief maintaining the self-identity intact. The aversion to a coherent system of thought is again reflected in the traditional organization of political parties. Thus the two major parties, the Democrats and Republicans, are more aptly described as instrumentalities for securing political power rather than as representatives of ideological beliefs.

> ...For the function of a political party in this country is not to preside over a philosophical debate, but to control and direct the struggle for power... (Reston 1965)

The American's distrust of systems of thought often leads him to underestimate the impact that a coherent ideology and philosophy such as Communism can have, because of its comprehensiveness, on other peoples whose thinking does not revolve around the individual. It provides an explanation of socio-economic conditions, makes projections of the future, and perhaps most important of all, provides a plan of action for the person as a member of a class rather than as an individual.

Cultural Variation of the Self-Concept

The concrete self-reference preferred by Americans becomes particularly important in work with counterparts overseas, since it determines their outlook toward problems and actions. For example, a Bolivian officer has insisted that Bolivia has one of the most advanced systems of social welfare in the world, and he referred to the country's constitution, in which the particular provisions are spelled out. The informed American usually objects to the claim. With a focus on the individual, he points out that the Bolivian worker does not receive the benefits that his constitution provides, therefore Bolivia does not have an advanced system of social welfare. To the Bolivian, the abstraction is important; but to the American, it is the involvement of the individual that matters. This difference in frame of reference is a recurrent issue between Americans and their counterparts overseas.

When confronted with people who do not identify the self with the individual, Americans react with bewilderment, since the idea of the self not being located in the individual is culturally preposterous for most Americans. Yet the Japanese point of reference seems to be the network of obligations among the members of a group--the social nexus. (See Nakamura 1964, pp. 409-417.) The consequence of this definition of the self is that congeniality in social interaction becomes the predominant value. To varying degrees a similar assumption pervades throughout the Orient. The stress on the relations among individuals rather than on the individual himself can be summarized in the concept of "face," with its concomitant ideas of "dignity," "prestige," and "respect." This concept is very confusing to American advisors, for what they suggest as objective and practical courses of action may be rejected to spare someone's face. Where this concept prevails, attitudes and courses of action can best be understood as intending to preserve affiliations in groups and to maintain congenial social relations, and only secondarily, to achieve certain goals which have a personal reference for the individuals involved.

The stress on social relationships can lead to another point of reference even further removed from the self-reference of Americans, and that is a concept of the state in which identity of the individual is submerged. Duty and obligation are demanded of the individual, who exists only for the state. The fanaticism and devotion to a cause or to country which this concept has generated among Germans, Russians, and others are usually little understood by Americans, who conceive of the state as a collectivity which exists to serve them and their relationship to it as one of rights. In the American view, the state assures the individual his freedom and rights, grants him security and protection, but respects his autonomy by not interfering in his life.

Self-Reliance

The American definition of the self underlies a number of values which are invoked indiscriminately and, hence, are not descriptive of behavior. Nevertheless, they carry considerable emotional impact. One of the most important ones of these is self-reliance, which in its pure form no longer makes sense in the complex technological culture of the United States, but which persists as a potent focus for the emotions and motivations of Americans. To the same extent that self-reliance is supposedly sought, its opposite, dependence, is avoided. Since Americans can envisage few fates worse than to be dependent, self-reliance is a powerful incentive, and it is one that Americans themselves may inappropriately employ to motivate people overseas. Although self-reliance is out of date in the United States--the American often functions best as the member of an organization--workers overseas are often quick to fall back on the frontiersman's ideals and hold at fault the foreigner who shows no liking for self-reliance.

The meaning of the value is neither translatable nor self-evident in other cultures. For example, in the Spanish of Latin America, self-reliance is translated as "independence" and carries essentially the same meaning that the word has in English: there is a suggestion of political and social freedom, as well as the implication of solitary action, but the idea of the self as the source and sole limiting factor is missing. These ideas are not congenial to the Latin, who has a strong attachment to his family and immediate group. Dependence is not deplored by him as it is by Americans. And among the Chinese, dependence on others is desirable, for it strengthens the relationship among people. Chinese parents, for instance, take pride in being dependent on their children and supported by them in a manner to which they are unaccustomed. It is apparent then that the American worker who appeals to self-reliance is talking against the current of values in the non-Western world, where relations to others, including dependence, take primacy over self-reliance.

Man is Separate from Nature

For the American, the perception of the self as a distinct entity provides a vantage point from which to view the world. It implies, also, a clear separation between man, on the one hand, and nature and all other forms of life, on the other. Man's quality of humanness endows him with a value absent in all other forms of life: he is unique because of his soul. Nature and the physical world, although referred to as living, are conceived

as material and mechanistic. But this view is not universal. Man is deemed a unique being in all cultures, for to many of the people of the non-Western world, he is just another form of life, differing from others only in degree. Nature is alive and animistic. Animals and even inanimate objects have their own essence. Hence, in parts of the non-Western world, no dividing line separates man from plants, rocks, rivers, mountains, and valleys. Hindus and Buddhists believe that life itself continues in endless cycles in which a soul can assume an infinity of forms. During one cycle, the soul may inhabit the form of a man, and in another take a different form, that of an animal, perhaps, or an insect. (Arensberg and Niehoff 1964, pp. 127-128) This view, which stresses the unity that prevails among all forms of life and inanimate objects, places man in a state of integration with nature and the physical world, instead of in opposition to it, as the American usually conceives of his relation to nature.

The attitude that a people assume toward nature and the physical world affects their mode of life. An obvious example is the Hindu who refrains from using cows for food because they are sacred, and even the cultivation of plants for food has been known to raise religious issues among them. A similar belief cannot exist for the American, who sees himself as separate from animals and nature. This twofold category of man-nature is a factor in the exploitative attitude toward nature, so characteristic of Americans, which has contributed to the amassing of material opulence. Without the rich resources of the continent and the requisite technological developments, such material richness could not have been achieved. Nevertheless, assumptions and values of the people are basic to social and economic development.

Materialism and Property

The American stress on material things, when considered from the point of the individual, is associated with a belief in the inviolacy of private property. It has been asserted that this value is at the root of the Constitution and the American conception of democracy. The popular assumption that private property is inviolate has frequently led to friction between Americans and the citizens or bureaucracies of other nations, with subsequent repercussions at the highest levels of government. U. S. relations with Latin countries have often been strained over the issue of private property, and danger to private property is the usual reason advanced by Americans for intervention or threatened use of force. (The Panama riots of 1964 are a recent example of this sort of action and reaction.) Also, negotiations between the United States and Latin American countries quite often revolve around the issue of private property for Americans, versus human rights for the Latins.

At the interpersonal level, many Americans also encounter difficulties in their dealings with non-Western persons who do not make a clear distinction between private and "public" property. American advisors and technicians report that American material sent overseas for use by governments quite often is diverted to private uses. One of the several reasons for this is the lack of a clear distinction between private and public property as the American understands it. Possession of property is affected by a person's position in society and his needs, as well as other considerations. The simple distinction between private and public property becomes blurred by these factors.

Americans consider it almost a right to be materially well off and physically comfortable. They expect swift and convenient transportation--preferably controlled by themselves, a variety of clean and healthful foods, and comfortable homes equipped with numerous labor-saving devices, certainly including central heating and hot water. The government is expected to ensure that food and drug products meet acceptable standards of health and that appropriate public health measures are observed by all people and agencies whose activities can affect the public's health. Associated with the values of physical comfort and health is the acceptance of cleanliness as being nearly identical with health, if not with "godliness."

Americans tend to project this complex of values centering around comfort and material well-being to other peoples. They assume that, given the opportunity, everyone else is just like themselves. Hence, they are disturbed by the sight of the rich churches of

Latin America standing in the midst of poverty, the Buddhist meditating among the suffering, and the rejection of American values throughout much of the world by men whose goals are esthetic and spiritual.

Measurable Achievement

In American culture achievement is given a material meaning, or at least a visible and measurable interpretation. This attitude leads to the American emphasis on technology and secondly, on publicity--rendering visible unrecognized accomplishments. Using these assumptions technicians and advisors in the field define progress in terms of technological change, probably reported by statistical data. Social progress, too, often comes to mean the number of schools erected, while there is no mention of the training of teachers. The concern with visible achievement often leads the American to lose sight of main issues; he may settle for a sensation, a personal triumph over a counterpart, or a specific accomplishment which has visibility and therefore can be reported as an achievement. A frequent visible achievement is the building of latrines. The persistence of Americans in building latrines all over the world for people who refuse to use them suggests that their appeal as projects may reside, in part, in their concrete visibility rather than in their potential role in controlling disease.

Since achievement has to be visible and measurable, Americans become very sensitive to praise or blame, more so than almost any other people. They do not develop the Englishman's self-assurance and his confidence in his own judgment, nor the self-sufficiency of the French. They depend on feedback from associates, and particularly on the visibility of their achievements. Both of these factors are missing in the overseas situation: achievements are usually few, and the reactions of one's associates are likely to be both delayed and diffuse. The American is quite often uncertain about the effects, if any, of his work. His work is compatible with an achievement orientation since he should be only a catalyst to his counterpart, with the primary function of providing information, skills, and judgment rather than concrete achievements. The counterpart is likely to have an ascriptive orientation and hence to be somewhat unconcerned with achievements. Deprived of his own visible success and frequently not seeing it in his counterpart, the American considers himself a failure. American culture does not provide a rationale for failure; hence it is very difficult to accept, and usually avoided by Americans.

Progress

Interrelated with material property and material well-being is the value of progress, which Americans often use to evaluate themselves and others. The concept is almost a cult in the United States, and many Americans are surprised to learn that it is unknown and may be rejected in the non-Western world. It refers to a diffuse constellation of beliefs and attitudes, lacking unitary value, and assuming various forms. Mead has traced the origin of the concept, in its broadest sense, to the role of the parents in the United States. (Mead 1965, pp. 133-136) In contrast to practices current in many parts of the world, American parents raise their own children, bravely assume responsibility for punishing them (which is actively avoided by parents in many cultures), and thirdly,

> ...act as if they themselves embodied all the virtues which they are busy enjoining upon the child. (Mead 1965, p. 129)

At adolescence, or thereabouts, the child usually realizes that the parents are not the paragons of virtue that they pretended to be in accordance with the cultural norm. The child, often corrected and chastized by the parents, has a residual sense of guilt and therefore feels inadequate to fill the vacuum of goodness and virtue left by the downfall of the parents. Throughout the psychological crisis thus precipitated, there usually remains the belief that there is something better than the parents and the self.

> And here, generation after generation, the belief in Progress is reborn in the minds of the young. Progress, the belief that there <u>is</u> something better than our own way of life, that our fumbling version of how men shall live with men

> here on earth, rests upon these very special mechanics, in which parents first hold themselves up as good and their children learn the rare and beautiful faith that there can be something better than oneself. (Mead 1965, pp. 134-135)

Progress and Optimism in Contrast to Limited Good

Although progress in American society finds many expressions, it is, perhaps, most frequently associated with the technological control of the environment. Most Americans tend to believe that the basic problems of the world are technological and that their solution will bring about economic welfare. Economics is the final arbiter of the good and desirable. Progress, then, quite often means the achievement of physical comfort, good health (or the facilities for giving medical care), material possessions, and a high standard of living. Throughout, there is an emphasis on convenience and the avoidance of danger and hardship. There is a distorted view of unpleasant biological facts of life--birth, disease, physical abnormalities, and death--the threat of which can be lessened through medical progress.

Bound up with the idea of progress in American culture is a feeling of general optimism towards the future. Most Americans feel that through their efforts a better future can be brought about which will not compromise the welfare and the progress of others. There is enough for everyone--a belief which is valid for people living in a country with an expanding economy and rich resources. In contrast to this expansive view of the world, Foster has described the "Image of the Limited Good," which he suggests is widespread throughout peasant societies* in the world. He writes:

> By "Image of Limited Good" I mean that broad areas of peasant behavior are patterned in such fashion as to suggest that peasants view their social, economic, and natural universe--their total environment--as one in which all of the desired things in life such as land, wealth, health, friendship, and love, manliness and honor, respect and status, power and influence, security and safety, exist in finite quantity, and are always in short supply, as far as the peasant is concerned. Not only do these and other "good things" exist in finite and limited quantities, but in addition there is no way directly within peasant power to increase the available quantities. It is as if the obvious fact of land shortage in a densely populated area applied to all other desired things: not enough to go around. "Good," like land, is seen as inherent in nature, there to be divided and redivided, if necessary, but not to be augmented. (Foster, 1965)

Since Good exists in a finite amount, an improvement in the position of an individual or a family is a threat to the whole community, for the gain must be a loss to someone else. The peasant's view of the natural and social world is usually limited to his immediate area, hence the loss must be to someone in the community. (Foster, 1965, pp. 296-297) For this reason, there is often found an effort to conceal material gain or other improvement in an individual's or a family's relative position in the peasant community. Or, the individual or family may neutralize the improvement, in the eyes of others, by showing, usually in prescribed ways, that there is no intention of using the improved position to the detriment of the community. (Foster, 1965)

In conclusion, progress is not a simple value. It reflects deep-seated characteristics of a cultural pattern. Those societies that do not have an appropriate temporal orientation, that do not emphasize material things, or that lack the concept of a developing and hopeful future are not likely to be swayed by the ideal.

---

*Peasant societies should not be equated to non-Western world; the expression refers to those areas where population is dense and land holdings limited [and usually controlled by the state or large landowners].

Achievement as Self-Motivation

The fulfillment of the individual, isolated in a mechanistic world, is attained in achievement, the motivation that propels the American and gives the culture its quality of "driveness." (Henry, 1963, pp. 25-26) Restless and uncertain, he has recurrent need to prove himself and thereby attain an identity and success through his achievements. Hence his accomplishments must be personal, visible, and measurable, since the culture does not provide a means of evaluating and knowing the self except through externals of performance and achievement. Unlike other societies, American culture does not attribute particular meaning to place of birth, family, occupation, politics, or the other ascriptive considerations which can be used to define the self. Emphasis of the culture is preserved primarily for personal achievement. The individual himself should set his own goals and then make up his own mind on how to pursue them. Motivation in the sense of long-range goals as well as motivation for a specific and immediate task should originate with the person. In American culture, coercion is disapproved; the stress lies on persuasion instead. The desire to act according to the wishes of others is instilled in the individual by means of examples, incentives, and appeals to self-interest and reason. Coercion, when necessary, should be applied informally so that the power of authority is masked. If possible, the individual is allowed to maintain the illusion that what he is compelled to do was decided by himself in his self-interest.

The idea of self-motivation naturally accompanies an identification of the self with a specific individual. Americans tend to dislike motives originating in others which are then applied to them. They strongly reject motivation in the form of orders, injunctions, and threats emanating from authority. Probably it is this dislike which makes Americans anti-militaristic, rather than a rejection of fighting or violence. (Gorer, 1948, p. 39) The overt authority of the military--based upon enforced discipline and the prerogatives of rank, which derive from status rather than achievement--is repugnant to the typical American. Nevertheless, the American military demonstrate that their assumptions and values are only a variation of the dominant American pattern. There is less emphasis on power and privileges of rank in the American military than in those of other Western countries.

Americans tend to reject authority when it is exercised over people. Control over things, such as natural resources, goods, services, money, etc., however, is considered either natural or desirable. (Gorer, 1948, pp. 40-41) This view is well adapted to the achievement motivation of the individual. This emphasis on achievement and, correspondingly, its disregard for the person, produces a side effect on the individual: he is made to feel that he is inherently replaceable and that his associates, though enjoyable, are also replaceable. This feeling spurs the American on to greater achievement. (See Henry, 1963, p. 29)

Ascriptive Motivation

Although achievement is the dominant motive for Americans, ascription exists as a variation. It is marked by an emphasis on <u>being</u>; the individual is defined as the member of a family, for instance, as is sometimes found in New England and the more traditional-oriented parts of the South, or the individual is defined according to his status or profession, as in the military. It is this kind of motivation, rather than achievement, which is shared by large segments of cultures throughout the world as the dominant motivation. Many of their actions can be understood as directed toward preserving and enhancing their particular position within the social structure, whereas considerations about tangible progress and improvement are secondary in importance, if present at all.

Individuals with an ascriptive motivation are usually enmeshed in reciprocal relations with members of their family, community, or trade and profession. These social links are much more binding than in the case of Americans with an achievement orientation. In Vietnam, for instance, an operator of a printing shop reports supporting his employees to the limits of his ability for six months after he was put out of business by government action. An American would probably not expect the same responsibility

from his employer. When an American joins an organization or a business, he does so as a free agent and usually preserves the right to move out whenever his purposes are no longer served by being a member. On the other hand, he usually accepts the fortunes of the organization, and if it fails, then it is up to the individual to find another position; the organization is not expected to maintain its employees on the payroll.

The patron system prevalent in much of Latin America also presents an intricate set of social relations between the individual and the patron. The latter may be the godfather of members of his estate and may extend, as a matter of obligation, personal services and considerations which would be foreign to the American overseer. As with the Vietnamese businessman, the obligations incurred are expected to transcend adventitious events of failure, poverty, or change of plans.

Competition and Affiliation

Competition is the primary method among Americans of motivating members of a group and some have seen it as a basic emphasis in American culture. (Potter, 1954, 59-60) Americans with their individualism and ideas on achieving respond well to this technique, but where the same approach is applied to members of another culture who do not hold the same values, the effort is ineffective, at best, and may produce undesirable consequences. People for whom saving face is important or for whom dependency on others is desirable will not accept competition among members of the group with the same enthusiasm as Americans. Thus, attempts to instill a competitive spirit in Laotian or Vietnamese soldiers have not been very successful, as the American advisors should have been able to foresee from observing the intense attachment of people of Laos and Vietnam to their family and village. The communal feeling toward each other excludes the incentive to excel others, either as a member of a group or individually. A military advisor shows his bewilderment at the Lao's lack of competition in the following words:

> Watching them play a game, volleyball, to us it's a game. I know when our teams compete, whether it's baseball or basketball, anything--we'd be serious, playing it because we like to win. With them, they wouldn't be; they would team up and have teams going, but they just didn't give a hoot whether they won or not.

The non-Westerner, with an aversion to competition, is likely to show more strongly developed affiliation,* as we have seen, for his own family and community. He knows, and knows of, fewer people than the typical American. Both his direct interaction with others through travel, work, and social life and his indirect contact through the mass media are likely to be much more circumscribed than for an American. He will be less self-conscious (See Bell, 1965, pp. 209-212) and less analytical of himself as an individual than the American. Beyond the confines of his immediate world and interest lies a world largely unknown to him. It is often endowed with danger to the unwary who travels beyond the limits of his own territory. An American advisor in Laos, training the Meo tribesmen for military service, points out that they were effective soldiers only within their own environment. Their knowledge of the outside world was meager and overriden with superstitions, which made the soldiers fearful and ineffective on operations outside their own geographical area. Within their own domain, however, their willing acceptance of military discipline and complete dedication to training made them excellent trainees.

The example of the Meo tribesmen is perhaps extreme, but the lack of feeling for being a member of a political entity, a nation, is generally prevalent. This fact is often obscured by the reports in the mass media of instances of intense nationalism on the part of individuals and groups in the non-West. These certainly exist, but are not typical of the great majority of the people throughout the world. It is misleading to

---

*Affiliation refers to the social need for the company of others, to companionship; whereas ascription refers to the qualities of being a person, a member of a family, a profession, etc.

consider peoples such as the Lao and the Vietnamese to be self-conscious members of their respective countries, in the sense that most Americans consider themselves to be citizens of the United States.

Although Americans have been described as primarily motivated by achievement, it does not mean that they do not show some affiliative tendencies. They are diluted in contrast to the strong social and territorial adhesion found in affiliations in the non-West. Mead describes the American nostalgia for his home town as symbolic of the question "Are you the same kind of person I am? Good, how about a coke?" (Mead, 1965, p. 29) The preoccupation with the home town is a way of establishing an affiliation among people who have little in "Common origins and common expectations." (Mead, 1965, p. 30) It is not an establishment of the influence of family and community with defined status and prescribed norms of behavior, which is the ascriptive orientation found in the non-West.

The Limits of Achievement: the Individual

During their history, Americans have exploited their physical enviornment as if it were unlimited. The vastness of the land and the opulence of its resources, perhaps strengthened the pre-existing belief that the limits to achievement are measured within the individual. The limitations on success are not ascribed to resources, to the actions of others, to the agency of government, nor to fate. If one has the desire and works hard enough, his labors will be rewarded with success. "Where there is a will there is a way." Furthermore, the achievements of the individual are not gained at the expense of others since there are enough rewards--material wealth, prestige, popularity--for everyone who aspires and tries. Doctrines such as Marxism, which promulgate inevitable conflict among classes because the goods of the world are acquired by a few who exploit the masses, have rarely achieved great favor among Americans. Traditionally, Americans have seen failure as a lack of will and of effort on the part of the individual. Successful accumulation of worldly wealth was a sign that the individual belonged to the select group who enjoyed the grace of God. The same idea is still present in a newer version: a rich man cannot be completely bad--or else he would not be rich.

The expansive view of achievement, and of the world, fostered in economic abundance in the United States contrasts sharply with the perception of a closed world prevalent throughout much of the non-West. The limited outlook is more than just the view appropriate to an economy of scarcity, involving the idea that what the individual aspires for and what he can achieve are limited: the primary motivation is ascription which tends to maintain the status quo in relationships among people. To explain these norms of behavior of traditional peasant societies, we return to Foster's idea of the Image of the Limited Good. The individual or family that acquires more than its share of a "good," and particularly an economic "good," is viewed with suspicion. Likewise, the individual who accepts a role of leadership will find his motives suspected and

> ...he will be subject to the criticism of his neighbors. By seeking or even accepting an authority position, the ideal man ceases to be ideal. A "good" man therefore usually shuns community responsibilities (other than of a ritual nature); by so doing he protects his reputation. (Foster 1965)

People do not compete for authority by seeking leadership roles, nor do they compete with material symbols such as dress, housing, or food which might make the individual stand out from the rest of the members of the village. The people in peasant villages show a strong desire to look and act like everyone else. By means of uniformity they attempt to be inconspicuous in position and behavior.

The stress on conformity in traditional peasant villages should be compared with the question of individuality. Once the individual in non-Western society fulfills the obligation of family, community, and tradition, he may be allowed considerable freedom to express his own individuality. Both conformity and individuality can be found in non-Western societies where the individual is perceived in terms of ascriptive qualities. It is necessary to ascertain for each society those areas in which individuality or uniformity holds.

The motive of achievement along with the stress on effort, work and rational risks, is not usually present in the non-West. The individual works to survive, but not to amass wealth--which like land--is perceived as inherent in nature. (See Foster 1965)

> ...It can be divided up and passed around in various ways, but, within the framework of the villagers' traditional world, it does not grow. Time and tradition have determined the shares each family and individual hold; these shares are not static, since obviously they do shift. But the reason for the relative position of each villager is known at any given time, and any significant change calls for explanation. (Foster, 1965, p. 298)

It follows from the above discussion that innovation or new techniques of working are also not perceived as related to wealth or in our terms to achievement. Instead, achievement is a matter of fate, an intervention by an outside agent that does not disrupt the relationships among the members of a community. One such agent is the lottery. By winning, the individual can improve his position without endangering the community. (See Foster, 1965, pp. 308-309)

People who have a "lottery" motivation, or a belief in an outside and adventitious intervention in their behalf, are difficult to convince of the virtues of hard work, effort, frugality, and initiative. Even if this attitude does not exist, or if it has been penetrated, the individual may still not accept the necessity of improving his position, for it will extend his obligations. Thus a young Peruvian fisherman refused aid to modernize his fishing technique for the reason that if he had more money, he would have more relatives to take care of. He doubted that he would be better off because of his increased responsibilities. (Foster, 1962, p. 92)

An absence of achievement motivation is not necessarily connected to the social and economic conditions of the peasant society indicated by Foster. Apparently a belief in "fate" or "luck" can be found in parts of the non-Western world, where density of population and limited land holdings are not a problem. In the interior of Brazil there exists a frontier environment. Land holdings are not limited, population is not dense, and to the west there is new land offering economic opportunities. Yet the people still subscribe to the "luck" motivation, being more concerned with buying tickets for the local game of "bicho" than with developing their local resources or moving west.* It might be argued that the psychological horizon is limited, and that they do not recognize that land and economic opportunities are available. Nevertheless, in the same area there is the precedent for squatters' rights. Individuals and families take physical possession of land, work it, and eventually acquire a right to it. This tradition does not indicate that the possession of land is seen as traditionally limited; there are ways of acquiring it, even if the individual is not aware of new land to the west.** This particular case of Brazil suggests that the absence of achievement motivation is not necessarily associated with closed communities of dense population, and limited land holdings. This indifference to personal achievement, associated with a belief in "luck," can also be found among people for whom the attitude has little relation to the economic conditions in which they live. It reflects their perception of the self and the world, as well as their concepts of motivation and fate.

Characteristics of Personal Relations

Personal relationships among Americans are numerous and are marked by friendliness and informality; however, Americans rarely form deep and lasting friendships. Friends and membership groups change easily as the American shifts status or locale; consequently,

---

*Foster, 1965, pp. 308-310, argues that the "brakes on change are less psychological than social." (310) Foster might disagree with the example above. On the other hand, the case of Brazil might be considered outside the scope of peasant societies. Foster stresses limited land holdings and density of population.

**Communication from Charles T. Stewart, Jr.

his social life lacks both permanence and depth. (C. Kluckhohn 1954, p. 96) Although social activities occupy much of his time, he avoids personal commitments to others. He does not like to get involved. A social act such as an invitation or offered gift is accepted and thanks are expressed. The recipient is not under obligation to reciprocate, although there is present the vague propriety of a return gesture. This social pressure, however, does not have the binding and formal quality of social obligations evident in other cultures. Americans usually prefer to pursue their social life under conditions that minimize incurring social obligations. Gifts, for instance, are customarily given to commemorate a birthday, an anniversary, or a festival such as Christmas. Outside of these well-established occasions, circumspection is observed so that giving a gift appears personally anonymous and its significance is carefully limited to avoid a personal meaning that might be construed as a bribe, seeking special favors, or as requiring reciprocity. In the activity of work, anonymity is commonly achieved by collecting donations from interested people, then awarding the gift to commemorate a specific departure, anniversary, or retirement.

The circumspection with which social relations are handled in the United States, so as to avoid social obligations, is in direct contrast with conventions in most parts of the world. The American "Thank you; I had a fine time," is insufficient recompense for an evening's invitation. The guest may be expected to bring flowers as in Germany. And for the non-Westerner, the American's vague feeling that a return gesture is appropriate may be replaced by an importunate obligation. One solution to social obligations, the Dutch treat, may seem crass to non-Americans, who prefer the convention of individuals taking turns in being the host in what might be called sequential reciprocity.

In other cultures, the American convention of anonymity in giving gifts is often seen to deprecate the meaning of the act. If the gift does not inconvenience or deprive the donor it has less meaning for the recipient. And when the American is successful in bestowing a well-received gift, he may be deprived of the "thanks" which is mandatory in his culture. In parts of India the expression for "thanks" does not exist, and social conventions have not required its invention. A social act is seen as the fulfillment of an obligation or a duty which requires no verbal acknowledgment. If the action, as in offering a gift, is not the consequence of an obligation, thanks would still be inappropriate. To imply termination of social interchange by an overt expression of thanks, places a finite value on the gift and cheapens its meaning.

Equality

Running throughout the American's social relationships with others is the theme of equality. Each person is ascribed an irreducible value because of his humanness. "We're all human, after all." Interpersonal relations are typically horizontal, conducted between presumed equals. When a personal confrontation is required between two persons of different hierarchical levels, there is an implicit tendency to establish an atmosphere of equality. Thus even within the definitive authoritarian structure of the military, a commanding officer may ask a subordinate a personal question, or offer a cup of coffee, before beginning a conversation. Furthermore, the officer is not expected to call attention to his rank and authority or exercise his personal power over a subordinate. One mark of a good officer, from the enlisted man's point of view, is that he does not "pull rank" or "use his authority as a crutch." In short, the good officer promotes a feeling of equality, the preferred social mode among Americans.

Discussing equality in the context of Americans working abroad, Mead says that:

> ...Americans...find it very confusing to shift from high to low status as the situation demands and...respond by a continuous endeavor to stabilize relationships. Their uneasiness often leads to an assertive attempt either to establish a superficially egalitarian ethos--as in the ritual use of first names for everyone, which is most disorienting to persons of many other cultures--or else to an attempt to establish hierarchies which are rigidly resistant to other considerations such as lineage and education. (Mead 1963, pp. 7-8)

It is clear that his cultural values predispose the American to function most effectively on an interpersonal level of equality. He is often confused when confronted with persons of a different status--particularly when it has been achieved through a legacy of special privileges. The ideal of equality makes it difficult for the American to understand hierarchical patterns of organization overseas, with the consequence that he tends to ignore political questions. He usually does not consider the fact that the loyalty of members of an organization may be the primary principle that explains otherwise unintelligible actions and promotions. Noting the absence of an emphasis on both achievement and equality, Americans may often fail to recognize the characteristics which determine who are the opinion- and decision-makers.

> ...For instance, that impoverished aristocrats or ascetic priests, beggarly in dress and looks, can still command respect and allegiance, despite their lack of outward signs of visible achievement and "success," is a difficult concept for Americans to grasp. Some people, like the Japanese, present another enigma; for they practice a kind of faceless leadership in which string-pullers exert their authority behind conspicuous but powerless puppet or ceremonial figures in public office. (Arensberg and Niehoff 1964, p. 135)

The cultural value of equality is restricted in application; it does not extend to some racial and ethnic groups, particularly the Negro. There are also strong hierarchical and authoritarian emphases in large-scale economic and political organizations. (Williams 1961, p. 441) Beyond these exceptions there remain further reservations to the value of equality. Although all persons are presumed to have equal legal rights and obligations (Williams 1961, p. 442), not everyone is presumed to be of equal talent and ability. The acceptance of inequality of potentialities is tempered by the typical American belief that in any grouping there are people of ability and of leadership potential. Their emergence awaits the right opportunity. It is the equality, of opportunity, that receives emphasis in American culture. Equality does not extend to achievements, success, or reward. (See Williams 1961, p. 442) As we have seen, Americans are usually individually interested in achievement and expect rewards commensurate with their accomplishments.

Confrontation

The indirection of the Japanese, and of all peoples for whom "saving face" is important, contrast with American assumptions and values ranged around the idea of confrontation--the man-to-man, and face-to-face, event. Confrontation in its most direct form begins when someone penetrates the spatial envelope of privacy surrounding each American. When someone draws nearer than about two feet to him (for example, arm's length), the American is likely to interpret this as a sign that he must fight or flee. For this reason, the close proximity Latins or Arabs prefer while conversing disturbs Americans, since physical nearness carries either sexual or belligerent meaning.* If the American backs away, then the Latin or Arab may feel that he is being treated with aloofness, if not hostility. In some cultures, however--Thai, Japanese--it is the American who often stands too close during a conversation.

The idea of confrontation goes beyond physical displacement. When faced with a problem, Americans like to get to its source. This means facing the facts, meeting the problem head on, putting the cards on the table, and getting information "straight from the horse's mouth." It is also desirable to face people directly, to intentionally confront them.

These American ideals are not found in those cultures where saving face is prized. The preferred mode of interaction in these societies quite often makes use of a third

---

*If interpersonal interaction is not expected, Americans are willing to stand quite close to each other, even touching: while standing in line or in an elevator.

party. Business may be conducted with another person by means of an emissary and not directly in a face-to-face confrontation of the principals involved. This indirection extends to aspects of life that the American considers personal and intimate, such as choosing a mate. The use of an intermediary allows both sides to mutually accommodate each other or to withdraw without losing face.

It is apparent that the value of confrontation (versus indirection) has wide ramifications for Americans overseas. It has been noticed even in the use of interpreters. The American sees the interpreter as a machine who translates from one language to the other; but in cultures where a third-person role is customary, the interpreter's role may become a much more active one, to the consternation of the American who is likely to interpret it as inefficiency or perhaps disloyalty.

Fragmentation and Totality of Personality

By defining people as doers, Americans can fragment their own personality or that of the other person. An American does not have to accept the other person in totality to be able to work with him; he may disapprove of the politics, hobbies, or personal life of an associate with whom he can work effectively. It is this trait of seeing others fragmented that provides the American with his ability to cooperate. An individual with ascriptive motivation, however, tends to react to others as total or whole persons. Frequently he cannot work with or cooperate with a person of different religion, belief, or ethical code since there is a total rejection of the other person. This tendency to accept or reject the person completely is at the root of the observation that Americans overseas have to watch every act, for what the American does away from work affects the attitude of his associates toward him.

Informality and Formality

Another aspect of confrontation is found in the informality and directness with which Americans tend to treat other people. This quality has disadvantages in working overseas, for when Americans employ their direct, brusque manners in dealing with other peoples, they are likely to insult or confuse them. The flowery language, complex methods of address, and ritualistic manners found in other cultures reflect the social structure of the people. When Americans fail to use the accepted forms of address, language, and manner, they also fail to accord the proper deference, and perhaps worst of all, they violate the prescribed methods of structuring social interactions. Whereas the average American considers formality, style, and protocol as pompous or arrogant, these provide dependable expectations in other cultures of behavior of other persons in social situations.* This function is particularly striking with the Japanese, who cannot communicate until they know the status of the other person since the language requires different forms to correspond to the status of the listener.

The foreigner encrusted by his formality can point to one of the consequences of American informality. Essentially, the American refers to everyone else in the same way; his preferred mode is equality. He reaches a first-name basis readily and early in a relationship. If the American develops a stronger attachment to another person, he experiences difficulty in expressing it. His only channel of communicating to others is direct, unadorned informality. The consequence is that the informality which at first may appear to be a friendly, personal way of treating others contributes to depersonalization, since informality--the breeziness, humor and kidding--is extended to everyone

---

*Formality tends to be maximal when social interactions are important; few and weak positive ties exist between the participants and when the interaction involves relatively severe conflicts of interest or values. (James W. Woodard, "The Role of Fictions in Cultural Organization," Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences, Series II, Vol. VI, No. 8, June 1944, as discussed in Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society, New York, 1961).

alike. Few discriminations are made among people; each one is kept at a depersonalized distance. Even "enemies" are likely to be treated with a controlled friendliness since Americans are usually reluctant to disrupt a social gathering "to make a scene" or "create a disturbance" by the open show of hostility.

Friendship

The generalized "friend" of Americans, serving to describe anyone from a passing acquaintance to a lifetime intimate, is differentiated into several gradations in many parts of the non-Western world. The nature of the relationship between two people is thereby more accurately defined. Friends may also be limited to specific classes of persons. Most frequently excluded are members of the opposite sex. Arab men, for instance, will not generally include a woman among their friends. Their relationships to women are familial, marital, or sexual. "Friends" in the non-West do not typically include parents, unlike the practice often met among Americans. Finally, friends are not typically shared as they habitually are among Americans. A friendship is likely to be jealously guarded out of fear of losing or diluting it if other friends are brought into the relationship. As Foster has suggested for much of Latin America true friendship is considered to be a scarce commodity. (Foster 1965, p. 298)

Personalization and Depersonalization

Although the typical American tends to see himself as a unique individual, with a private core inaccessible to others, other persons, as a rule, are regarded as representatives of a class. They are not usually endowed with the same uniqueness reserved for the self. Hence most Americans are relatively impartial and objective in the conduct of social relations, in contrast to the personalized interactions found in most of the non-Western parts of the world. Examples are found in the paternal benevolence of the Japanese, the personal leadership of the Latin caudillos, and the nepotism endemic to the non-West. In each instance, Americans are likely to make a value judgment of "undesirable," since this is personalized interaction in areas where Americans are accustomed to depersonalized behavior.

"Personalization" is a desired quality for most Americans, implying good will, trust, and acceptance of other people for what they are. In describing American social relations as "depersonalized," and those of the non-West as "personalized," an invidious comparison is not intended. Trust and good will, for example, need not be personalized. And in turning to the personalized non-West, a chief characteristic of social relations is the distrust and suspicion repeatedly found among people. Personalization in social relations does not necessarily imply good will and trust.

This depersonalized behavior of Americans, along with the values of achievement and equality, nurture competition as a means of social interaction. Each individual strives for his own personal goals. This disposition is found in personal interactions among individual American men, where "friendly joshing," freely given advice, quick repartee, and the "friendly suggestion" are subtle forms of competition. The individual who has the last word is "one up" on his companion, at least until the latter tells a better joke, or in some way gives a twist to the competition that elevates him to the "one up" position. Although this sort of behavior in interpersonal relations may seem innocuous to Americans, such actions assume the proportions of competition and subtle coercion to other peoples. (See Wax and Thomas, 1961)

Cooperation and "Fair-Play"

Competition among Americans occurs within the context of cooperation, for competition requires a considerable amount of coordination among individuals and groups. When the individual competes, he is most likely at the same time cooperating with others. The typical American ability to cooperate is one of the advisor's most important assets overseas, for he may act as a catalyst to induce others to work together. One of the reasons Americans can do this--and they are well known for it--is that they do not give of themselves wholeheartedly to a group or organization. They pursue their own personal

goals, while cooperating with others who likewise pursue their own. They accept the goals of the group, but if their expectations are unfulfilled, they then feel free to leave the group and join another. This separation between membership in a group and personal objectives allows the individual to adjust his goals to those of other group members if this is necessary for carrying out joint action. To the American, this compromise is practical, allowing him to achieve a benefit that he could not attain on his own. Cooperation is given for the sake of action, and it does not imply that the American yields his principles. He is in fact expressing a dominant assumption of American culture, the activity of doing. Principles, concepts, and values are accepted only when they make a difference for activities in the world.

The importance of getting things done and a sense of urgency are often joined to elicit cooperation from members of a group who genuinely disagree with respect to either their principles or their objectives. Thus in many areas of American life, a deadline or the prospect of future opportunities are frequently invoked in group deliberations as a means of overcoming individual differences. An appeal is made to "Let's get the job done, and then we can take care of these other problems." Or, "Work with us this time, and next time we'll go your way." Next time, however, frequently is displaced to the future, for Americans have a tendency to compromise on each issue. Everyone is expected to accommodate to the joint action, unlike the French who are more likely either not to compromise, or to accommodate completely. Each person has a turn in having his own way. In this area of social cooperation, Americans behave in a manner analogous to the "Dutch treat."

It is apparent that the American's preference for doing--for action--may work against his individualism in a social setting. The necessity for compromise in cooperative action may undermine other values, principles or objectives of the individual. To ensure that his adjustment or compromise is not more than is necessary, the American is likely to stress the means used to reach a group decision. In formal groups, for instance, he may be concerned with matters of agenda and procedure which tend to give some formal protection to the rights of the individual.

The American's abilities for cooperation and organization are not as a rule found abroad. The Latin, for instance, cannot adjust his goals to those of the group, or make a practical adjustment "to get the job done;" this would be a compromise of principles. Likewise, in formal groups, the Latin may see the raising of matters of agenda or other matters of group deliberation as avoiding the issue, whereas for the American it may be a matter of facilitating decisions fair to all. The concept of fairness is often invoked by the American in situations where the Latin would understand the issues to implicate "dignity of man," "honor," or principles of belief. (See Erikson 1965, p. 315) These are concepts that are not frequently current in everyday behavior of Americans.

The value of fairness is not confined to face-to-face encounters in formal groups. It has widespread ramification, often occurring as the value of "fair play." The essence of it is not so much rules which ought to be followed as

> ...the inclusion of the other person's weakness inside the rule so that "fair play" included in it a statement of relative strength of the opponents and it ceased to be fair to beat a weak opponent. (Mead 1965, p. 143)

The English notion of "fair play" as modified in the United States is both an arbiter of personal relations among Americans and a motivating force. The American will stand up for his fair share, and will be concerned with fairness toward others. He cannot initiate action if it involves aggression since he does not believe in beginning a fight. It becomes very important for him to be able to say "they started it," and then of course, "but we'll finish it." The significance of the value--accommodation to the weakness of another--is brought out in the mutual misunderstanding of the concept between Americans and members of other cultures. Americans cannot understand the deliberate and ruthless exploitation of a weak adversary by power and position in other cultures. On the other hand to others the concept of fair play may seem foolish, and actually untranslatable into some languages, German for instance. (Mead 1965, p. 143)

Need to be Liked

Americans usually react to others as achievers and as participants in certain activities, rather than as whole persons; hence they usually establish a relationship on the basis of a common activity or interest, seldom comprehending the other as a total person. The usual view of the other is that of a potential response, and it follows that the average American tries to anticipate the effects of his words and acts on others.* He envisions the desired responses and is likely to gear his actions accordingly. The characteristic of seeing others as responses is reflected in the emphasis on communication in interaction and in the great value placed on being liked. Overseas, this tendency is seen in the American's belief that the common people throughout the world will like him, and he has often been fortunate in going to countries that were either neutral or favorably disposed toward him. It is difficult to say what would be the reactions of Americans if they had to work in places where they were not liked, for the American's esteem of others is based on their liking him. This requirement makes it difficult for Americans to implement projects which require an "unpopular" phase. In the words of an English anthropologist, signs of friendship or love are:

> ...a necessity for the American. He is insatiable in his demands for them, for any occasion on which they are withheld raises the gnawing doubt that maybe one is not lovable, not a success. (Gorer, 1948)

Signs of friendship--the glad handshake, the ready smile, the personal appeals of business and advertising--become part of the normal way of behavior. Whenever the American is deliberately denied expressions of friendship or popularity, his reactions are confused.

Americans require personal assurances of being liked; social success for them often becomes a necessary part of achievement. Americans tend to judge their personal and social success by popularity, almost literally by the number of people who like them. It should be noted, however, that to be liked does not mean that one should like in return. To be liked, or loved, means simply that one is worthy of love.

Specialization of Roles

A perspective on the individual has been maintained thus far in considering social relations in American culture. This point of view may be reversed for the purpose of looking back at the individual from the vantage point of social roles which American culture, and all other cultures, provide to integrate the individual as a functioning member of society. These patterns of expectations and behavior are assumed by the individual according to his personal and social characteristics, and according to the conditions under which he engages in a specific activity.

When the middle class American male leaves his home to go to work, he leaves behind him his role as a family man and enters a world in which he is expected to make a clear separation between personal matters and his job. His work itself, whether civilian or military, is separated into occupational roles. In American culture specialized roles are developed and filled with specialists who deal with special functions and problems. The basic distinction of American civilian and military organizations separates line from staff. Within this basic split the development of specialized roles can proceed virtually unchecked. This is as one might expect in business or in the military whenever technical skills and complicated machinery are involved; however, the same tendency towards specialization of roles occurs in the realm of interpersonal relations, since the American's divisive attitude toward personality induces him to perceive others as achievers rather than as whole persons.

---

*This emphasis on the other is different from the concern shown by the Oriental that his partner may say or do something which would lead him, or his partner, to lose face. The other person is seen as an entity, although perhaps a worthless one. To the American the other person is quite often not an entity, but a response to his own actions.

The separation of social and occupational roles and functions in American society does not correspond to the patterns found in other cultures. Many people, for instance, find it difficult to understand the American insistence on separating planning from operations. Specialization of roles in itself can also become a problem. Many Americans overseas complain that their opposite numbers do not delegate authority, which perhaps may be interpreted to imply an absence of specialized roles, all functions are vested in the leader. This pattern of leadership is congruent with the concept of the whole person--the ascriptive orientation.

The typical American division of line and staff provides a contrast for the tendency in Latin America for each person in an organization to become a focus of power, which corresponds with the ascriptive orientation. The American idea of organizational channels of authority* are obscured, competing interests are set up, and authority and power are diffused. Needless to say, occupational effectiveness is sacrificed. This kind of social organization is representative of the assumptions and values of Latin cultures, and hence the American style of social organization might not be effective. The American advisor overseas should be willing to adapt to local values and perhaps experiment with an overlapping system of organization, or some other form in which line positions and staff positions gradually merge.

Comparative Judgments

As a technician or advisor, the American overseas almost invariably judges the local society by his standards of material comfort, defined in the broad sense including physical comfort and health. He perceives his work to be congruent with his values and attempts to improve the health and promote the welfare of the local people, forgetting that the simple hygienic practices--sanitary toilets, vaccines, etc.--cannot be easily demonstrated to be effective in maintaining health. The American himself probably accepts them as part of his culture, rather than on the basis of their demonstrated effectiveness. Quite often sophisticated observations and successive measurements over a period of time are required to make obvious the advantage of health measures.

The propensity to make twofold judgments is interrelated with the American tendency to see the world in terms of black or white, and in the American character, at any rate, it is related to a predisposition to action. That is in part due to the fact that the dichotomies which Americans set up are unequal: one element is usually valued more than the other. This characteristic can be seen in the following common dichotomies: work-play, good-evil, peace-war, military-civilian, right-wrong, successful-unsuccessful, and man-nature. These polarities simplify the view of the world, predispose to action, and provide Americans with their typical method of evaluating and judging by means of a comparison. This last point is so pervasive that it deserves elaboration.

The American advisor in Southeast Asia is likely to evaluate his counterparts according to the norms of the U.S. and to decide accordingly that they are better, the same, or worse. He is likely to give advice on the same basis: "You should do thus-and-thus because that is the way it is done in America." The implicit American standard is used throughout for making estimates and justifying advice. It may well be that his comparative basis of evaluation is what gave rise to the opinion that Americans believe whatever is American is superior. Although this view has to be reckoned with by Americans going overseas, it may not be completely fair opinion. In part it may reflect the comparative basis of judgment, which can be seen in any area of American life. The

---

*The ideal of the pyramid as the organizational form with a clear distinction between line and staff is no longer realized in many American organizations. This can be clearly seen in the military, where the form of organization often is the diamond. The basic problem which the Army is facing, and has not successfully solved, is that the commanding officer must make decisions based on technical knowledge outside his competence. In effect "the expert" makes the decision, and the necessity for his presence has inflated the number of staff and semicommand positions, giving the Army its diamond shape rather than the classical pyramid. (See Janowitz 1959, pp. 28-34)

American resists describing or judging something in terms of itself, or in its own context. Instead he insists on a comparison. He evaluates himself against others like himself; he judges a movie against other movies he has seen; he judges his children against the norm for their age; and then most naturally, he judges other people against Americans. The evaluation of "good because" is more naturally rendered as "good as."

The constant mention of American values, or of previous experience of the advisor, may well aggravate the position of the advisor or consultant, which is a delicate one at best. Regardless of the American's attitude, his very presence suggests that he has knowledge or skills that the local people do not have. The American, by his mere presence, is already precariously near to suggesting implicitly that he is "better" than the local people; and when he evaluates and justifies through a comparison with American norms, he may be laying the groundwork for a reputation of arrogance.

Americans, then, tend to perceive the world in dichotomies and to evaluate and justify by means of comparisons, which usually suggests that the standard of comparison is better. It is perhaps this tendency which has contributed to the American reputation for moralizing. Whenever Americans observe graft, unusual sexual behavior, cruelty, or a different way of leading or of planting a crop, they tend to make comparisons on the basis of their conception of American behavior in a similar context. They subsequently arrive at a judgment of good or bad, which may mean immoral in one instance or "it doesn't work" in another. The American usually does not take into account the fact that what he observes overseas is the behavior of members of another culture. He makes a direct comparison and draws a conclusion from it, whereas a Chinese, for example, is likely to say "that is American," rather than "that is bad." Completely oriented to the situation, the Chinese might judge the context to be inappropriate and thus avoid labeling it as bad. The implication would be that at the proper place and time it would not be bad. In the words of an anthropologist, comparing the American and the Chinese:

> ...The usual Chinese description of things American is that they are different; but the usual American view of the Chinese is that they do everything in the wrong way. (Hsu, 1953)

Form of Activity and Third Culture

The American assumptions and values associated with doing may have both advantages and disadvantages for advisors working overseas where the form of activity differs from their own. Americans can find courses of action where none have been perceived before; conversely, the American's desire to move and move quickly may be very upsetting to his counterparts. Advisors have reported counterparts who were shunted aside or in some other way effectively removed from important positions because they initiated action, and thereby violated the values of their own society and organization. Unlike American leaders, leaders in ascriptive societies are not expected to take action and to exercise their influence. Their function is to maintain the status quo, and what they do is entrench themselves in their positions. They are usually not rewarded for initiating change and achieving progress; these are American ideas associated with achievement and action.

When Americans go overseas as advisors, the temptation to get something done frequently becomes so strong that they disregard their advisory roles and attempt to do the job themselves. In the Philippines, for instance, Peace Corps Volunteers engaged in training teachers resorted to doing the teaching themselves rather than fulfilling their mission of teaching Filipino teachers. The Filipino teachers resented being observed by others while teaching in their classrooms, and when the Volunteers taught demonstration classes, the Filipino teachers left the classrooms. Finally, the Volunteers themselves took over the classes for three or four months, but they finally realized that their approach was not very satisfactory, recognizing that the American values of "efficiency" and "time consciousness" were a hindrance to cooperation. They also mentioned that "when a problem came up, it was the American who immediately decided what to do about it. The Filipinos made no effort to do anything about a problem they might have, outside of mentioning it." The Americans added that they felt they took action primarily "because of

the great difficulties involved in the Filipinos doing anything about it."* The objective of training teachers was subverted.

The typical reaction of the overseas American advisor--doing the job himself--reflects both the form of activity of doing, and the self as the responsible party. If he rejects these, accepting the norms of his counterparts and the local culture, he vitiates the reasons for his own presence. Presumably he is there because he is both an American and an expert; he has needed knowledge, skills, and attitudes which his counterpart does not have. If the American acts upon his form of activity--doing--and pushes through with his own ideas and energy, he may alienate his counterparts and the local people; and even if by dint of his personality and efforts, the advisor completes his task, its success may not "take" in the local culture, and his accomplishments may be nullified once he leaves. This latter possibility apparently is often not appreciated by Americans who strive for a quick-impact project, who attempt to complete something before their tour overseas is finished. They fail to adequately integrate their work into the social structure and neglect the cultural customs and traditions needed for the success of even such simple changes (from the American point of view) as the introduction of sanitary toilets or a more effective technique of farming. Most Americans seem predisposed to believe that the desirability of the innovations they advocate is self-evident; hence they feel that their efforts will inevitably be crowned with success.

The most effective approach for the American advisor is still a matter of conjecture. He should have an understanding of both the foreign culture--the first culture--and of his own--the second culture. His own work will be carried out in the milieu of a third culture which is

> created, shared, and learned by men of different societies who are in the process of relating their societies, or sections thereof, to each other. (Useem et al., 1963)

---

*Paraphrased by the interpreter of a verbal report of a Volunteer.

BODY RITUAL AMONG THE NACIREMA[1]

Horace Miner

The anthropologist has become so familiar with the diversity of ways in which different peoples behave in similar situations that he is not apt to be surprised by even the most exotic customs. In fact, if all of the logically possible combinations of behavior have not been found somewhere in the world, he is apt to suspect that they must be present in some yet undescribed tribe. This point has, in fact, been expressed with respect to clan organization by Murdock.[2] In this light, the magical beliefs and practices of the Nacirema present such unusual aspects that it seems desirable to describe them as an example of the extremes to which human behavior can go.

Professor Linton first brought the ritual of the Nacirema to the attention of anthropologists twenty years ago,[3] but the culture of this people is still very poorly understood. They are a North American group living in the territory between the Canadian Cree, the Yaqui and Tarahumare of Mexico, and the Carib and Arawak of the Antilles. Little is known of their origin, although tradition states that they came from the east. According to Nacirema mythology, their nation was originated by a culture hero, Notgnihsaw, who is otherwise known for two great feats of strength--the throwing of a piece of wampum across the river Pa-To-Mac and the chopping down of a cherry tree in which the Spirit of Trust resided.

Nacirema culture is characterized by a highly developed market economy which has evolved in a rich natural habitat. While much of the people's time is devoted to economic pursuits, a large part of the fruits of these labors and a considerable portion of the day are spent in ritual activity. The focus of this activity is the human body, the appearance and health of which loom as a dominant concern in the ethos of the people. While such a concern is certainly not unusual, its ceremonial aspects and associated philosophy are unique.

The fundamental belief underlying the whole system appears to be that the human body is ugly and that its natural tendency is to debility and disease. Incarcerated in such a body, man's only hope is to avert these characteristics through the use of the powerful influences of ritual and ceremony. Every household has one or more shrines devoted to this purpose. The more powerful individuals in the society have several shrines in their houses and, in fact, the opulence of a house is often referred to in terms of the number of such ritual centers it possesses. Most houses are of wattle and daub construction, but the shrine rooms of the more wealthy are walled with stone. Poorer families imitate the rich by applying pottery plaques to their shrine walls.

While each family has at least one such shrine the rituals associated with it are not family ceremonies but are private and secret. The rites are normally only discussed with children, and then only during the period when they are being initiated into these mysteries. I was able, however, to establish sufficient rapport with the natives to examine these shrines and to have the rituals described to me.

The focal point of the shrine is a box or chest which is built into the wall. In

---

[1]Horace Miner, "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema," American Anthropologist, Vol. 58 (1956), pp. 503-507. Used by permission of the author and the publisher.

[2]Murdock, Georpe P., Social Structure. New York, The Macmillan Co. (1949)

[3]Linton, Ralph, The Study of Man, New York, D. Appleton-Century Co. (1936)

this chest are kept the many charms and magical potions without which no native believes he could live. These preparations are secured from a variety of specialized practitioners. The most powerful of these are the medicine men, whose assistance must be rewarded with substantial gifts. However, the medicine men do not provide the curative potions for their clients, but decide what the ingredients should be and then write them down in an ancient and secret language. This writing is understood only by the medicine men and by the herbalists who, for another gift, provide the required charm.

The charm is not disposed of after it has served its purpose, but is placed in the charm-box of the household shrine. As these magical materials are specific for certain ills, and the real or imagined maladies of the people are many, the charm-box is usually full to overflowing. The magical packets are so numerous that people forget what their purposes were and fear to use them again. While the natives are very vague on this point, we can only assume that the idea in retaining all the old magical materials is that their presence in the charm-box, before which the body rituals are conducted, will in some way protect the worshipper.

Beneath the charm-box is a small font. Each day every member of the family, in succession, enters the shrine room, bows his head before the charm-box, mingles different sorts of holy water in the font, and proceeds with a brief rite of ablution. The holy waters are secured from the Water Temple of the community, where the priests conduct elaborate ceremonies to make the liquid ritually pure.

In the hierarchy of magical practitioners, and below the medicine men in prestige, are specialists whose designation is best translated "holy-mouth-men." The Narcirema have an almost pathological horror of and fascination with the mouth, the condition of which is believed to have a supernatural influence on all social relationships. Were it not for the rituals of the mouth, they believe that their teeth would fall out, their gums bleed, their jaws shrink, their friends desert them, and their lovers reject them. They also believe that a strong relationship exists between oral and moral characteristics. For example, there is a ritual ablution of the mouth for children which is supposed to improve their moral fiber.

The daily body ritual performed by everyone includes a mouth-rite. Despite the fact that these people are so punctilious about care of the mouth, this rite involves a practice which strikes the uninitiated stranger as revolting. It was reported to me that the ritual consists of inserting a small bundle of hog hairs into the mouth, along with certain magical powders, and then moving the bundle in a highly formalized series of gestures.

In addition to the private mouth-rite, the people seek out a holy-mouth-man once or twice a year. These practitioners have an impressive set of paraphernalia, consisting of a variety of augers, awls, probes, and prods. The use of these objects in the exorcism of the evils of the mouth involves almost unbelievable ritual torture of the client. The holy-mouth-man opens the client's mouth and, using the above mentioned tools, enlarges any holes which decay may have created in the teeth. Magical materials are put into these holes. If there are no naturally occurring holes in the teeth, large sections of one or more teeth are gouged out so that the super-natural substance can be applied. In the client's view, the purpose of these ministrations is to arrest decay and to draw friends. The extremely sacred and traditional character of the rite is evident in the fact that the natives return to the holy-mouth-men year after year, despite the fact that their teeth continue to decay.

It is to be hoped that, when a thorough study of the Nacirema is made, there will be careful inquiry into the personality structure of these people. One has but to watch the gleam in the eye of a holy-mouth-man, as he jabs an awl into an exposed nerve, to suspect that a certain amount of sadism is involved. If this can be established, a very interesting pattern emerges, for most of the population shows definite masochistic tendencies. It was to these that Professor Linton referred in discussing a distinctive part of the daily body ritual which is performed only by men. This part of the rite involves scraping and lacerating the surface of the face with a sharp instrument. Special women's rites are

performed only four times during each lunar month, but what they lack in frequency is made up in barbarity. As part of this ceremony, women bake their heads in small ovens for about an hour. The theoretically interesting point is that what seems to be a preponderantly masochistic people have developed sadistic specialists.

The medicine men have an imposing temple, or latipso, in every community of any size. The more elaborate ceremonies required to treat very sick patients can only be performed at the temple. These ceremonies involve not only the thaumaturge but a permanent group of vestal maidens who move sedately about the temple chambers in distinctive costume and headdress.

The latipso ceremonies are so harsh that it is phenomenal that a fair proportion of the really sick natives who enter the temple ever recover. Small children whose indoctrination is still incomplete have been known to resist attempts to take them to the temple because "that is where you go to die." Despite this fact, sick adults are not only willing but eager to undergo the protracted ritual purification, if they can afford to do so. No matter how ill the supplicant or how grave the emergency, the guardians of many temples will not admit a client if he cannot give a rich gift to the custodian. Even after one has gained admission and survived the ceremonies, the guardians will not permit the neophyte to leave until he makes still another gift.

The supplicant entering the temple is first stripped of all his or her clothes. In every-day life the Nacirema avoids exposure of his body and its natural functions. Bathing and excretory acts are performed only in the secrecy of the household shrine, where they are ritualized as part of the body-rites. Psychological shock results from the fact that body secrecy is suddenly lost upon entry into the latipso. A man, whose own wife has never seen him in an excretory act, suddenly finds himself naked and assisted by a vestal maiden while he performs his natural functions into a sacred vessel. This sort of ceremonial treatment is necessitated by the fact that the excreta are used by a diviner to ascertain the course and nature of the client's sickness. Female clients, on the other hand, find their naked bodies are subjected to the scrutiny, manipulation and prodding of the medicine men.

Few supplicants in the temple are well enough to do anything but lie on their hard beds. The daily ceremonies, like the rites of the holy-mouth-men, involve discomfort and torture. With ritual precision, the vestals awaken their miserable charges each dawn and roll them about on their beds of pain while performing ablutions, in the formal movements of which the maidens are highly trained. At other times they insert magic wands in the applicant's mouth or force him to eat substances which are supposed to be healing. From time to time the medicine men come to their clients and jab magically treated needles into their flesh. The fact that these temple ceremonies may not cure, and may even kill the neophyte, in no way decreases the people's faith in the medicine men.

There remains one other kind of practitioner, known as a "listener." This witch-doctor has the power to exorcise the devils that lodge in the heads of people who have been bewitched. The Nacirema believe that parents bewitch their own children. Mothers are particularly suspected of putting a curse on children while teaching them the secret body rituals. The counter-magic of the witch-doctor is unusual in its lack of ritual. The patient simply tells the "listener" all his troubles and fears, beginning with the earliest difficulties he can remember. The memory displayed by the Nacirema in these exorcism sessions is truly remarkable. It is not uncommon for the patient to bemoan the rejection he felt upon being weaned as a babe, and a few individuals even see their troubles going back to the traumatic effects of their own birth.

In conclusion, mention must be made of certain practices which have their base in native esthetics but which depend upon the pervasive aversion to the natural body and its functions. There are ritual fasts to make fat people thin and ceremonial feasts to make thin people fat. Still other rites are used to make women's breasts larger if they are small, and smaller if they are large. General dissatisfaction with breast shape is symbolized in the fact that the ideal form is virtually outside the range of human variation.

A few women afflicted with almost inhuman hypermammary development are so idolized that they make a handsome living by simply going from village to village and permitting the natives to stare at them for a fee.

Reference has already been made to the fact that excretory functions are ritualized, routinized, and relegated to secrecy. Natural reproductive functions are similarly distorted. Intercourse is taboo as a topic and scheduled as an act. Efforts are made to avoid pregnancy by the use of magical materials or by limiting intercourse to certain phases of the moon. Conception is actually very infrequent. When pregnant, women dress so as to hide their condition. Parturition takes place in secret, without friends or relatives to assist, and the majority of women do not nurse their infants.

Our review of the ritual life of the Nacirema has certainly shown them to be a magic-ridden people. It is hard to understand how they have managed to exist so long under the burdens which they have imposed upon themselves. But even such exotic customs as these take on real meaning when they are viewed with the insight provided by Malinowski when he wrote:

> Looking from far and above, from our high places of safety in the developed civilization, it is easy to see all the crudity and irrelevance of magic. But without its power and guidance early man could not have mastered his practical difficulties as he has done, nor could man have advanced to the higher stages of civilization.[1]

---

[1]Malinowski, Bronislaw. Magic, Science, and Religion. Glencoe, The Free Press, (1948)

A REVERSE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER ON ASSIGNMENT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA*

By Jose de la Montana

Even from the first I have been a strong admirer of the United States Peace Corps. What a marvelous idea! In 1961 when the first batch of volunteers came to my country I was flooded with tears of admiration. God alone knows how difficult it is for us natives to live in my country, let alone young Americans. Yet, they were ready to sacrifice the luxuries and freedoms of their country to live among and serve us.

You can imagine my elation when I read that the United States was sponsoring an exchange or reverse Peace Corps. They were going to select and sponsor foreigners like myself to work in the States.

I wanted so much to serve my country and at the same time pay back the Americans for all they had done for us. I wondered, however, what possible contribution I could make. I had gained my master's in economics and community development at the University of San Pedro--our country's finest university--but I could not see much use for such credentials in economically developed America.

After considerable thought and anguish I did apply. The placement test was very vigorous, as well it should be, but I passed with what you say as "flying colors."

A difficulty did arise, however, in the background check done on me by the American Embassy. It seems as though I had taken an economics course from a Jesuit instructor in my sophomore year which caused the Embassy some problems. In the course we had reviewed some of the works of both Marx and A. Lenin. They questioned me very extensively about the course, but quite frankly their understanding and orientation towards Communism was so vague and limited that I had difficulty responding to their questions. Apparently I did alright, for in less than three months I was on my way to training.

Fifty-three Reverse Peace Corps Volunteers reported to the training station located in the mountains outside San Juan, Puerto Rico. We represented twenty-six different countries but each of us was as enthusiastic as the other. Our training program was for eleven weeks, with seventy to eighty hours per week spent in the classroom. Our initial commitment to service no doubt served to carry us through the hard work that followed.

Trainees were divided into two groups for future assignment. One group would work in the States of the South, and one group would work in New York City. I was selected for work in the South.

My language instructor came from Athens, Georgia, and although I spoke English very well, having been trained by American priests, it was the task of the instructor to teach me the Southern dialect or accent. This was not easy, yet there was enough humor in it for us to sustain ourselves. By speaking Southern at all times we eventually emerged as quite fluent.

---

*In late 1965 the United States Department of State sponsored an exchange Peace Corps program. Modeled after our own successful Peace Corps program, volunteers from twenty-six countries came to the United States to serve as change agents in areas of critical need--health, welfare, education. Senor Montana served as one of those volunteers and in this article relates some of the difficulties and enjoyments coming from his experience in this country.

We spent most of our time in cultural studies and this part of training proved the most difficult for me. For years I had listened to the voice of America in my country and thought that I understood the cultural and social aspects of American society quite well. Perhaps part of the problem was with the instructors. They seemed quite pessimistic about American life and sometimes appeared to be hostile.

Nothing gave me as much difficulty as trying to understand black and white relationships. At that time there was considerable discussion in the States about the meaning of black power and I felt it imperative that I understand the full meaning of it.

I was very confused. It seemed to me that Senators Eastland and Thurmond were the strong believers in black power because they forecasted all kinds of dangers would happen and was happening by exposing whites to blacks. As I understood it, if this were an integrated society, the black people would destroy schools, white women, the economy, even the government. That seemed like a lot of power to me for a people claimed to be inferior. Stokely Carmichael, on the other hand, seemed to be saying that the black people had no power and needed it. He appeared to me as much more moderate than Thurmond or Eastland, yet most people were calling him a radical.

We also had extensive physical conditioning, but nothing like that experienced by the New York RVPs. They were taught judo, karate, and for the last week of training were given survival training. They were parachuted out of planes over the Puerto Rican jungles and the only equipment they were given was a piano wire. The wire was for decapitating chickens, wild hogs, or other live animals they might need for food. The instructors maintained that these lessons were highly appropriate for survival in New York and as foreigners the group certainly needed it.

After completion of training I was assigned immediately to a small town in the Appalachian section of Kentucky. My dialect training was really inappropriate, but I thought this was a small problem which I understand Peace Corps volunteers invariably confront. I was assigned as a community worker to the local anti-poverty agency.

The countryside was the most beautiful of any I had ever seen. Every opportunity I had I spent out of doors. Following community development philosophy, I spent my time listening and talking, but never telling and trying to remain in the background.

For six months I listened and gathered facts, focusing in on the most serious problems felt by the Appalachian community. I read every article and publication I could find.

My elation soon gave way to depression. The people in this Kentucky coal country lived on some of the richest earth in the world, yet they were among the poorest and deprived of any people I have encountered. Even in my country, where the per capita income is under $400 per year, we do not have such a single and contained ghetto of deprivation. Here there were many suffering from malnutrition, particularly the young and the old. Coal miners who were 45 looked to be 65, and invariably they had lost a limb or were suffering from respiratory disease. There were few services in health or welfare available and these were highly restrictive and bureaucratic.

My study of the economy made all of this incongruous. The profits coming to the land holding companies were some of the highest in the country. Yet, those same companies demonstrated almost no responsibility for the conditions of the people or the preservation of the natural surroundings. Like many of the wealthy in my country, the owners of the companies were absentee landlords who were interested only in profit.

I diligently studied the complex problems from both an economic and community development point of view. I committed myself to come up with a plan of action that would bring relief and perhaps prosperity to the people. As a foreigner, I realized the necessity of formulating a proposal that would be in the context of American culture.

Fortunately, I had brought with me many of the papers and speeches by outstanding Americans addressing themselves to similar kinds of issues of poverty in my country.

Following these particular American notions, I developed a comprehensive land reform measure for Appalachia. The thrust of my proposal would require the absentee landlords to divide the property they now owned in such enormous quantities among the Appalachia poor who now lived there. It was not a revolutionary document for in fact it repaid the absentee landlords very substantially for the property rights they had purchased. In many cases they had only paid a mule or a barrel of whiskey for hundreds of acres of mineral rights. Under my measure they would be entitled to a 20% return on their initial investment.

After many days and nights of hard labor, I presented my proposal to the county board of supervisors. I was not at all prepared for the reaction I received. To a man, the local government officials accused me of being a socialistic, communistic, outside agitator. Their wrath was considerable and I left feeling both dejected and alone.

The word soon spread through the community that I was an undesirable. Doors that had been opened were now closed. Still, I would not let my despair get the best of me. There were others who would surely listen to me.

The mine workers union had a courageous history of working in the interest of the miners. They had fought hard against the irresponsible landlords, surely they would support land redistribution for their people. After several days of trying to get an appointment, I finally was admitted to see the President of the "local." He listened impatiently to my proposal and then brusquely lectured me for interfering in the internal affairs of this country. He said that I could do much more if I went back home and worked on my own problems. If I did this, maybe then they wouldn't have to pay so "god-damned many taxes to us commie sympathizers." My interview ended in less than ten minutes.

Where had I made such serious errors in judgment? Had not Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson urged land reform on my country and others in the underdeveloped free world? Had not the great names in the United States Senate--Fulbright, McGovern, Hatfield, McCarthy, and Morse--demanded land reform if we were to continue receiving a foreign aid allocation? Why was it that land reform was seen as the correct procedure in my country and dismissed as communism and agitation in this most underdeveloped section of America?

I took my meager savings and purchased a bus ticket for Washington so that I might present my modest proposal to at least one of America's outstanding liberal Senators.

Upon arrival in Washington I went at once to the Senate Office Building. After many attempts I was ushered in to see the Administrative Assistant of a famous Senator. He listened to me very carefully and told me of the deep interest the Senator had in my country, the reverse Peace Corps, and, of course, the poor of Appalachia. After a twenty minute discussion he gave me the name of a hotel and told me to wait there for a call.

I stayed by the phone and within thirty minutes received a call, but not from the Senator. It was from the State Department official responsible for the RPC program. He was quite excited and told me not to leave, he would be right over.

The next day I was on the way home to my country. My tour as a reversed Peace Corps volunteer had only lasted eight months. The State Department had been quite understanding and in fact has offered me a volunteer assignment in the flower arrangement program in Atlanta, Georgia. I felt that I had seriously failed in one program and I certainly did not want to stir up the flower arrangers in Atlanta, so I returned home.

Being back now for several months I still look upon my experience with some amount of joy and satisfaction. I love Appalachia and I respect its people. I only regret that I could not be of service to a great country that has done so much to its people and mine.

The reverse Peace Corps program has now been cancelled. I am very hopeful that some day, when we foreigners learn more, we will be allowed to return to the United States of America. The Peace Corps is a marvelous idea for Americans!

THE 100% AMERICAN

By Ralph Linton

Our solid American citizen awakens in a bed built on a pattern which originated in the Near East but which was modified in Northern Europe before it was transmitted to America. He throws back covers made from cotton, domesticated in India, or linen, domesticated in the Near East, or wool from sheep, also domesticated in the Near East, or silk, the use of which was discovered in China. All of these materials have been spun and woven by processes invented in the Near East. He slips into his moccasins, invented by the Indians of the Eastern woodlands, and goes to the bathroom, whose fixtures are a mixture of European and American inventions, both of recent date. He takes off his pajamas, a garment invented in India, and washes with soap invented by the ancient Gauls. He then shaves, a masochistic rite which seems to have been derived from either Sumer or ancient Egypt.

Returning to the bedroom, he removes his clothes from a chair of southern European type and proceeds to dress. He puts on garments whose form originally derived from the skin clothing of the nomads of the Asiatic steppes, puts on shoes made from skins tanned by a process invented in ancient Egypt and cut to a pattern derived from the classical civilizations of the Mediterranean, and ties around his neck a strip of bright-colored cloth which is a vestigial survival of the shoulder shawls worn by the seventeenth century Croatians. Before going out for breakfast he glances through the window, made of glass invented in Egypt, and if it is raining puts on overshoes made of rubber discovered by the Central American Indians and takes an umbrella, invented in southeastern Asia. Upon his head he puts a hat made of felt, a material invented in the Asiatic steppes.

On his way to breakfast he stops to buy a paper, paying for it with coins, an ancient Lydian invention. At the restaurant a whole new series of borrowed elements confronts him. His plate is made of a form of pottery invented in China. His knife is of steel, an alloy first made in southern India, his fork a medieval Italian invention, and his spoon a derivative of a Roman original. He begins breakfast with an orange, from the eastern Mediterranean, a cantaloupe from Persia, or perhaps a piece of African watermelon. With this he has coffee, an Abyssinian plant, with cream and sugar. Both the domestication of cows and the idea of milking them originated in the Near East, while sugar was first made in India. After his fruit and first coffee he goes on to waffles, cakes made by a Scandinavian technique from wheat domesticated in Asia Minor. Over these he pours maple syrup, invented by the Indians of the Eastern woodlands. As a side dish he may have the egg of a species of bird domesticated in Indo China, or thin strips of the flesh of an animal domesticated in Eastern Asia which have been salted and smoked by a process developed in northern Europe.

When our friend has finished eating he settles back to smoke, an American Indian habit, consuming a plant domesticated in Brazil in either a pipe, derived from the Indians of Virginia, or a cigarette, derived from Mexico. If he is hardy enough he may even attempt a cigar, transmitted to us from the Antilles by way of Spain. While smoking he reads the news of the day, imprinted in characters invented by the ancient Smites upon a material invented in China by a process invented in Germany. As he absorbs the accounts of foreign troubles he will thank a Hebrew deity in an Indo-European language that he is 100 per cent American.

THEY DID NOT CARE*

Richard S. Latham

This particular civilization devoted itself to the pursuit of science and mechanics as an end in itself. During this period the desire and ability to experience an emotional life in terms of beauty fell dormant, and men devoted themselves to the refinement of commerce, trade, and the evolution of the machine. The women, as in all history, were forced to spend most of their time caring for and maintaining these machines, and their leisure was occupied with certain games (bridge would be an example), and audio and visual communications called "commercials." The only interest evident in the arts was a practice known as "collecting," in most cases devoted to accumulating works of art created by other or previous cultures. Some examples would be "coins," "matchbooks," and "paintings."

They were a happy, healthy people and spent a great deal of time listening to radio and television (which replaced the theater), and going about in large crowds "looking" at one another. They also "looked" at magazines (which replaced poetry and literature), although some books continued to be written mainly for "collecting" or "collections," as they were called. The arts of walking and conversation were replaced by the automobile and cocktail party (this last may only be mythology, as there is no physical evidence of what it was, exactly.)

It is difficult to explain how an entire civilization could become preoccupied to this extent with money (printed paper) and the machine; but one statistic explains a great deal about the way these people lived and thought.

In 1963, in the U.S.A., people spent five hundred million dollars on repairs for a thing they called the automatic transmission. This was exclusive of the cost of the device itself which, if added together, might be on a magnitude of a billion and a half dollars. The device was a small mechanical power transformer which was a secondary part of their vehicles and its main purpose was to eliminate a thing called a "clutch pedal," which required the use of the left leg and foot intermittently while driving. This statistic becomes relevant only when related to the fact that all of the time and/or money spent on painting and sculpture during this same period was less than one quarter of this amount.

Concerning the more mundane, useful objects, the design of these artifacts followed no apparent logic during this period. There are two broad characteristics under which all these objects may be grouped: 1890 to 1910, soft; 1910 to 1930, hard; 1930 to 1950, soft; 1950 to 1970, hard (and square). There is no logical explanation for these groupings, but it is a fact that during the periods mentioned, most artifacts and architecture followed a sculptural approach related to the basic form noted. In the 1930-to-1950 period the forms were less hard, and characterized by rounded corners, both in buildings and objects. From 1950 to 1970 most forms became as square as possible in buildings and objects. There was no genuinely aesthetic reason for this. It was not a "style" as such of the total period, but a clever "fashion." It seems that as succeeding generations took over the design of artifacts, each felt it necessary to be different from the previous (they called it "school"). This one fact, "the attempt to be different" (called "modern"), seems more valid as an objective for this culture's design than any other, and yet, taken as a whole, no society has ever produced so many minor variations on what were essentially the same generic forms.

---

*The American Civilization Conference at Princeton. Published in Who Designs America? Laurence B. Holland (ed.), Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1966. "The Artifact as a Cultural Cipher," pp. 278-80.

The machine during all of this period became more "automatic," a word which, as understood by the culture, signified the elimination of the need for a man's senses. The general trend of industry and the machine was toward the elimination of man. When this is viewed in relation to the cultural trend of concentrating on the sciences, it begins to explain a great deal about the confusion, both emotional and visual, represented in the objects designed during this time.

Man was under the impression that he had abandoned nature as a model of beauty and was finding a new beauty in the machine itself. What he failed to understand was that beauty does not exist either in nature or in the machine, but wholly in man's mind. And it was this that had been abandoned, the emotional part of man that needs and creates beauty.

Editor's Note: The practice of designing ordinary artifacts is not significant enough to be compared to the creative arts, and the work that results does not contribute enough to the society or last long enough to affect it, for better or worse. On what basis, then, is it worth discussing? Perhaps this note, better than any philosophical discussion, could act as a cipher for the future archaeologist trying to understand how a society that reached the richest material standard in history could proliferate such confusion and ugliness in its artifacts and on its landscape.

ROLE OF AN AMERICAN

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

By B. P. R. Vithal

As the State Coordinator I am often asked why we request Peace Corps Volunteers at all. It is not as if we in this country lack the necessary technical manpower, particularly of the degree of competence that a Peace Corps Volunteer is likely to have; and even where we lack it we have sufficient training and educational capacity to be able to fill the gap within a reasonable amount of time. It is therefore not as if we need Peace Corps Volunteers because we lack technically trained or competent persons; nor is it that the competence of a Peace Corps Volunteer is likely to be such that he can be a technical advisor to the Indian counterpart, he is not a USAID expert.

What then is it that we look for when we ask for a Peace Corps Volunteer? When we place a Peace Corps Volunteer in any program it is not that we thereby obtain a person with a training and skill that is not available in any Indian counterpart. But we are able to place him at a level in the program where this training and skill are most needed and at which particular level we seem to be unable to get an Indian counterpart with similar competence. The non-availability of personnel is therefore not absolute but is felt in a relative sense and is only one more reflection on the general problem of a lack of mobility in our society; but more important than this, what we look for in a situation for which we ask for a Volunteer is whether the nature of the task is such that attitudes that the Volunteer has make his most significant contribution. We expect he would have ingenuity, initiative and dedication, not only because he would not have been a Volunteer had he not had these qualities in ample measure, but also because the underlying assumption is that it is these qualities, and the attitudes that both create these qualities and arise from them, that have contributed to the making of modern America.

It is this expectation that also places most of the limitations which a Volunteer must recognize and accept. The role of a Volunteer would be more in the sphere of attitudes than of knowledge or skills. Knowledge can be transmitted through teaching and skills can be imparted by training, but attitudes can be influenced only by example. Your greatest influence should therefore be exercised through example and not through any conscious teaching or preaching.

Remember that in being a Volunteer you are a different kind of person even in your own country. It is not everybody that volunteers for the kind of work that the Peace Corps involves and the very fact that you're a Volunteer makes you different, for better or worse, from most other persons. This will be all the more so when you come here, because the basic urges that made you volunteer to come here are, due to historical and economic circumstances, even more muted in our society. You have therefore constantly to remember that your counterpart is not a volunteer. He is an ordinary official who is doing a job because he has to earn his living. He may be honest, competent and conscientious and yet the measure of his work can never be the same as many of yours. The situation in the orphanage may have difficulties--physical or otherwise; and yet your attitude to them will be different because you have volunteered to come here; in fact, the more difficult the circumstances the more happy you are likely to feel. But the Indian counterpart is not there because of his choice and, perhaps, in many cases it is against his wishes. He has a family to take care of, a salary that is generally inadequate, and a job that he has taken on purely material considerations and not because he considers it a mission in life. When you therefore compare your reactions with his in any given situation, you have to remember these differing circumstances and constantly tell yourself: "I am a volunteer; he is not." And whenever his performance or motivations fall short of the ideal you may have set for yourself, remember again that it is not due to the fact that he is an Indian and you are an American, but because he is an official doing a job and you are a

volunteer on a mission. There would perhaps have been the same difference between you and an American official.

You are all mostly young and you have come here before you have had any experience of working in a structured situation even in your own society. There are certain problems that are inherent in any structured situation. There are certain aspects of human nature, many of them not very desirable, which come out when a person functions in such a situation. Struggle is very often the only form of survival in this situation, and a struggle does not always bring out the best in man. Without therefore any experience of a structured situation even in your own culture, you would be for the first time functioning here in a situation which is extremely hierarchical. You must, therefore, remember that while some of the problems you face may be peculiar to the Indian situation as such, still you would have faced many of them in any structured situation.

You will be seeing life at a level in India that you might not have seen even in your own country. You will see the seamier side of politics; but please remember that politics is the same even in your own country. Many of the things that you see here in the capitol are, let me assure you, quite common in many City Halls in the States. When politics frustrates you, remember that politics is the life breath of democracy. And if there is one thing that is as vital to you as it is to us, it is that this country should remain democratic. You cannot on the one hand expect us to be democratic and on the other blame us for much of the pettiness and frustration that goes with democratic functioning.

Take one thing for granted; essentially in terms of human quality there cannot be any difference between us and you. Remember constantly that your own Constitution is based on the "self-evident truth" that all men are born equal. Do not therefore let any number of instances that you may come across create in you any feeling of inherent superiority. If you find the Indian counterpart failing in many obvious respects, remember firstly what I have already said, that he is not a volunteer, but an average Indian doing a job to earn his keep. Even so you will find that in terms of moral and intellectual qualities the Indians you would be meeting would be equal to their counterparts in any other society. Every society has its share of the bad and the good. What prevents them from making their due contribution, however, is not any individual lack in each one of them, but the fact that all of them are prisoners of a system.

It is the system that prevents the Indian official from giving of his best or from obtaining results even when he does give of his best. The system has to be fought, it is the task of the Indian, this is not your task. It is not for you to try and change the system. Your only task is to understand it, and, if possible, to see how with this understanding you can beat it; but it is not for you to attempt to undermine it.

Sometimes perhaps you might be able to circumvent it; but this is not the same as beating the system with its own rules. By circumventing it you may perhaps be able to get some job done. But here we come to the most crucial point. What exactly should be the measure of your satisfaction with your own achievement? Are you here to do a job or get a job done? Anything that you do by yourself will certainly be an achievement in itself and perhaps would give satisfaction and joy to a few people. But the crucial question is whether it would have any effect after you have left. Your real endeavor should therefore be not merely to get some job done which may give you some subjective satisfaction, but to show your Indian counterpart and others how the job can be done, given the limitations of our system and the circumstances of that situation and, with only this difference, that you have brought to that situation your initiative, ingenuity and dedication. The crucial test therefore is not your individual success but whether you have been able to show that the same thing can be repeated by the Indian also if only he also shows the same qualities. The extent to which, therefore, you have been able to succeed by methods which the Indian cannot adopt, your success has no significance to him. What you should seek is not admiration but emulation.

There will always be certain ways open to you because you are a foreign volunteer. You can short-circuit the system, you can circumvent it, you can ignore it in certain circumstances; but the Indian counterpart cannot do any of these. If you want therefore to

show how your American ingenuity can achieve better results, you will have to do it only by yourself also voluntarily working within the limitations of the system. In order to be able to do this, you should be able to understand the system and its working.

It is also necessary to understand it if you do not want to inadvertently add to your problems. One of the features of our administrative system is that it rarely has two-way communication and its feedback is very often ineffective. You, on the other hand, are used to a system where feedback is considered essential. When you attempt it here, therefore, you should see to it that you do not do it in such a way that the system reacts strongly against a flow of communication contrary to its usual direction. You should also see that it does not create unexpected complications for your Indian colleagues at your level. And yet there are certain ways in which it can be done once one understands the intricacies of the system. The main route of communication may appear to be a one-way traffic, but with a little patience one can always discover numerous by-passes which go in the reverse direction. It is in this, and many other such ways, that one has to explore the informal flexibility that the system has quite contrary to what its formal flexibility and rigid structure would lead one to believe initially.

Very often you will get a feeling that the administration is indifferent to the point of callousness. It is no doubt true that it is so in some cases. But you must remember that even here it would be wrong to make a sweeping generalization and the more insight one develops, the more qualification one would be willing to accept. You work in a small area in a given program. The problems of that area and that program dominate your thoughts and actions, and when you find that those at higher levels are not attending to your problems, you may feel that they must be indifferent. The program you are dealing with is something that concerns children. The younger you are and the more imaginative you are, the easier it would be for you to believe that this man must be evil who can be so indifferent to the problems of starving children. But remember that every time a problem is not solved, it is not necessarily due to indifference. Your problems are only a part, and very often a minor part, of the totality of problems that someone higher up has to deal with. He has to look at it in its perspective at that level and, because of the limitations that poverty imposes on our country, he has necessarily to assign priorities, and your problem and your program may not get that priority, no matter how urgent or how tragic it might appear to you.

Apparent indifference or even callousness is the defense mechanism that is needed for mere survival in societies overladen with problems. Nature in its mercy gives us a defense mechanism whereby we seem to be sensitive to problems only within a reasonable distance of being able to solve them. It is only the insane or the saints who can be sensitive to problems that humanity is nowhere near being able to solve. Take your own country. It is not as if the Negro problem is new. It is not as if sensitive men of your country have been born only in the last few decades. And yet the most sensitive men of each age became aware of this problem only in stages, each stage being related to the historic possibility of the solution. Lincoln was aware of the indignity of slavery, but perhaps not of much else. The succeeding generation woke up to the other problems and became sensitive to the need for equal facilities, but was as yet insensitive to the inequality that separation itself implies. And it is only now that finally men are sensitive to all aspects of this problem. So also in this country there are a number of problems, which you can immediately identify with your sensitivity nurtured in a more affluent climate to which you may think we are indifferent or callous. No doubt this has to be fought because all indifference is a blunting of human sensitivity, but remember that all men are not crusaders and for a majority of them, nature in its mercy limits sensitivity to historic feasibility. Even in this matter, therefore, one has to constantly bear in mind cultural differences and remind oneself that there are no moral imperatives or absolutes but only historically and socially conditioned reactions.

The question was asked in anger whether the Secretary overfed children. The intention perhaps was to show up the indifference of urban well-to-do to the kind of problems that you are facing in your particular program. As I have said, this is not indifference. That a problem has to be assigned a lower priority is a sign of necessary realism and not of indifference. But look at this question in its larger perspective. You have heard that one of our greatest needs is to break away from feudal loyalties and the joint family. The

basis of these arguments is that the single generation family alone can give the kind of motivation for material advancement and saving that is essential for economic development. You cannot therefore on the one hand blame these ancient values for preventing India from modernizing and at the same time expect the kind of sensitivity to continue which would make a man consider the problem of all the starving children before he feeds his own children. This does not mean that modernization and economic development kills all sensitivity; a more refined sensitivity does reappear but only later with affluence. All these implications must be constantly borne in mind before you make value judgments across the frontiers of different cultures and societies. Even in one's own society, righteousness is often only vanity and across societies it rarely has a justification. And remember that this is a land where it has been taught that righteous indignation is a contradiction in terms.

Your catholicity must extend ultimately even to conceding that perhaps the basic premise with which we started may itself not be correct. I said at the beginning that what we expect the volunteer to contribute is more in the realm of attitudes, and that is based on the unstated assumption that the qualities of initiative and ingenuity that make America what it is would also help us find solutions to many of our problems. But maybe this will not be so; maybe, the problems are too deep-rooted and too intractable to be solved merely by a change in attitudes. One has to have the breadth of vision and the generosity of spirit to be able to concede even this, if necessary. For America the New Frontiers were the challenge. For India Old Fences are the challenge. The motivation required is different. While the former requires a conquering of the fear of the unknown, the latter requires a conquering of the fear of the known. Still, initiatives and ingenuity may help us break down old fences just as they helped you cross new frontiers. But you must keep an open mind on this. You must retain your sense of mission without becoming in any sense a missionary.

IMPROVING COMMUNICATION WITH CAMPESINOS AND OTHERS
A Proposal for the Increased Use of Verbal Imagery

John Hatch*

Communication and Motivation

As an agent of change the Peace Corps Volunteer is essentially a motivator of people. He seeks not to impose change but to encourage people to change themselves. People change because they have a reason or incentive to do so. They must feel that change is in their own interest, or that of their sons, their family, their community, etc. It is the job of the motivator to communicate this interest convincingly, to describe reasons and incentives for change in a manner which can be easily understood by people who often have little or no education and whose view of the world is greatly restricted. To communicate effectively is a difficult job and one which few Volunteers manage to do well. It can not be done by pantomime or hand signals alone, nor can one always depend on a movie, slide show, or other visual aids. Instead, in most if not all episodes in which a Volunteer seeks to motivate others he must rely on his own ability to verbalize concepts. He must express himself in language. He must choose words which convey the same meaning to others as to himself. To do this presupposes a certain degree of skill and fluency in Spanish.

But it is not a matter of language fluency only. Were fluency the principal ingredient of effective communication, our Spanish-speaking host-country counterparts would all be perfectly fit for the job of motivating their countrymen, which is not all the case. It is a frequent experience to see Peruvian professionals speaking over the heads of their less-educated audiences, the SIPA extension agent speaking to Sierra Indians about slope gradients, chemicals, degress and percentages; or the INCOOP extensionist lulling the farmers of an agricultural cooperative into dull somnolence as he explains refined concepts of administration, management, or the social philosophy of Robert Owen. And in a country where flowery public speech-making is commonplace, fluency often runs rampant with the object being not what one says but how elaborately he says it. Here it becomes obvious that language fluency is only effective in communication and motivation when kept under strict control.

On the other hand there are many Peace Corps Volunteers, with adequate vocabulary and command of Spanish grammar to communicate basic concepts and ideas effectively, who are not "getting through" to the people they seek to motivate. Communication is missing the target.

The problem is a "communication gap." It arises from the fact that the Volunteer's life experience--what he knows--has been endlessly extended by reading, travel, and a college education. He comes from an environment in which he shares an enormous body of concepts and experiences in common with many other people. He is accustomed to communicating in the abstract and is used to taking for granted the ability of others to do so. Consequently, the differences between his and the campesino's life experiences is so large it is practically unimaginable. Yet for purposes of communication the Volunteer needs to bridge this gap. At the same time he has to dramatize his communication much more than he has ever done before. In comparison with other cultures, North Americans tend to be reserved people. When we speak our gestures are simple, our bodies remain rooted and stiff. The very sound of English is not nearly as expressive as Spanish. Thus the effectiveness with which a Volunteer communicates in Spanish does

---

*Peace Corps Volunteer (Community Development) in Colombia, 1962-1964. Associate Director in Peru, 1965-1967. The author is now at the Escondido Training Center.

not only depend on the content he communicates but also how he communicates it--the tone of his voice, the color and imagination with which he describes things, the way he moves his arms and body, and the way he works his face.

The Utility of Verbal Images

For thousands of years before man learned to read, and for many centuries since, the transfer of knowledge from generation to generation has largely been by word of mouth. The learning process was mostly a matter of memorizing. Content memorized usually took the form of stories and parables. Learning was highly dramatized. In essence, the story-teller was an artist drawing elaborate images and pictures in the mind's eyes of his audiences through the use of language. Learning served an entertainment purpose and consequently memorizing a story was far easier and undertaken eagerly. Memorization was not an exact word-by-word exercise but rather a creative act, stories being embellished with each learning and each re-telling. If a story told of a certain animal, the listener imagined that animal in his own private way in accord with his own concepts of animals. If the story told of something ugly or beautiful, the listener adjusted the same to conform with his own concepts of ugliness or beauty. The ability to comprehend was strictly related to the limiting boundary of one's own life experience and vocabulary. For example, the story-teller would not say: "The Spanish came and killed 10 of our brothers with their guns." Rather, "The white men carried long sticks which spoke fire and smoke and killed our 10 brothers with invisible arrows." It wasn't the most efficient way of transmitting knowledge, but it was understood. The imagery was vivid and dramatic. It left a deep impression on an illiterate's mind.

This kind of communication continues today among pre-school children before they learn to read. It continues in many rural areas of Peru where illiteracy is high. It continues among many farmers who have managed to receive two or three years of primary education only. But the application of the verbal image-building process can be extended almost indefinitely into society-at-large. Pictures and imagery attract practically everybody.

For over a year now co-op Volunteers in Northern Peru have been getting involved in cooperative training programs (cursillos) for Peruvian farmers. At a very early stage in their activities it became obvious that successful communication was not taking place. It was decided that lectures were too long. Both Volunteers and INCOOP participants agreed to reduce lectures to 30 minutes or less and place primary time and emphasis on small group discussion circles to maximize opportunities for the participation of the farmers. Simultaneously Volunteers began to use verbal imagery to explain basic principles or concepts about cooperatives. In the following pages many of these images are presented with the hope of demonstrating their simplicity and their applicability to communication with campesinos. These images are by no means perfect. With more attention to imagery now, better ones could easily be developed. What is needed is that more Volunteers become actively involved in creating imagery appropriate to other fields of Peace Corps activity.

Verbal Images Applied to Co-op Work

1. Savings (ahorros): "A co-op is like a field of corn." When the corn receives rain, when it is irrigated, it grows strong and tall. The plants are green and healthy. But when there is no rain, no water, the corn dies. So it is with a co-op. The water the co-op needs is the savings of its members. When the members don't save, when they don't give water to their co-op, it dries up like a field of corn and dies.

2. Shares (ahorros) and Interest on Capital: "Saving in a co-op is like building a house." If a man decided to build a house he must first make a large number of adobe. If he is lazy and makes only one or two adobes he can't build anything. What can he make with ten adobes? Nothing! But if he continues to build adobes day after day, month after month, someday he will have enough to build a fine

house. The same is true of a co-op. A co-op can't be built from one day to the next. If each member only contributes one adobe to the co-op it will never be built. Each share in the co-op is like an adobe. But if every member, once a month, buys a share, contributes an adobe, there will someday be enough to build a large, beautiful, comfortable co-op house. For each adobe, each share contributed by a member, the co-op will pay once a year a certain amount of money agreed upon by all members. The member who has contributed only one adobe, one share, will receive very little. But the member who works to build 10, 20, or 30 adobes will receive 10, 20 or 30 times more money. Year after year each adobe, each share, will earn money for the men who made it.

3. Co-Op Ownership: "The story of (five) brothers." A few years ago in the sierra of (Cajamarea) an old man who had no children decided to sell his 15 hectareas of land and move to Lima. A neighbor heard about the sale and wanted to buy the land but he didn't have enough money and the old man wanted cash. So the neighbor quickly called his (four) brothers together and proposed this plan: "Not a one of us has the money to buy the land himself. But if all five of us put our money together we will have enough to buy the old man's land. Then, instead of dividing the 15 hectareas in five portions--because some parts are better than others and it would be difficult to divide it fairly--we can plant the land as if it was one big farm. This way we will make more money, and after the harvest we will divide the earnings fairly. Each one of us will be an owner of the same farm." The other brothers quickly agreed to this plan. Together they bought the land, earned lots of money, and lived happily ever after. (The story can be embellished endlessly at the discretion of the story-teller.) A co-op is like the farm of the five brothers. Each member is an owner of the co-op, and its profits must be distributed to all the owners who have put money into the co-op and participated in it.

4. Concepts of Loyalty, Unity and Strength: "The Old Man and the Twig." An old man who was about to die called his three sons to his bedside and asked them: "As my last request I would like the strongest of you to break in half this bundle of sticks." First, the youngest son tried--with all his might--but he failed. The second son couldn't break the sticks either. Nor could the oldest and strongest son. So the old man smiled, took the bundle of sticks, untied the string which bound them, and broke three sticks, one after another. "These three sticks " he said, "...are my three sons. As long as you work separately, each on his own, you will be weak and easily broken. But if you work together you will be strong and you will never be broken."

   Co-op Loyalty: "Many a co-op is like a beautiful woman." When she is young and lovely everyone falls in love with her. But after a while, one by one, her admirers get tired of her and lose interest. A strong co-op requires a special kind of love. A strong co-op is like a mother, and the loyalty of her members is like the loyalty of sons to their mother.

5. Co-op Structure: "A co-op is like a tree." The sturdy trunk, the strength of the tree, is the co-op members. The more members the co-op has the stronger and taller it is. A young co-op is like a young tree. Its trunk is slender and its roots are shallow. But as it grows its roots sink deeper and its body grows larger and stronger. The Administration Committee is the first sturdy branch of the co-op tree. The next branch is the Education Committee. As the co-op tree grows larger it grows more branches, more committees. But the Vigilance Committee--they are like ants that live on the tree. They are busy and curious and never stop working. They run up and down the trunk of the co-op tree, and back and forth between its branches carrying messages and investigating and checking to make sure that the co-op tree is strong and healthy.

6. Other Images for Vigilance: "The Vigilance Committee is the guardia civil of the co-op." "The Vigilance Committee is like the faithful farmer who watches over his farm." "A co-op whose Vigilance Committee does not function is like the farm whose

owner plants his crop and abandons it, letting the weeds grow up and the birds eat his seed." "A co-op whose Vigilance Committee does not function is like the store owner who leaves the door to his tienda open all night, allowing any thief to enter and carry off his goods." "Since every member of the co-op is also an owner of his co-op each has the responsibility of making sure that the Vigilance Committee is doing its job. If the Vigilance Committee, the guardian of the co-op is not doing its job, the co-op members must elect new officers to the Vigilance Committee."

7. The General Assembly: "The General Assembly is like a large family reunion." "The General Assembly is the end of the old year and the beginning of the new year for the co-op." It is the day that all the members gather to measure how far the co-op tree has grown, the big day in which the members count the number of adobes contributed to the co-op house and decide how much will be paid to each member for each adobe. The general assembly is the day the entire co-op family gathers together to celebrate the end of the harvest and to make plans for the new planting season. To forget the co-op general assembly is like the son who forgets his mother's birthday.

8. Co-op Statutes (Estatutos): "The co-op estatutos are the language of the co-op." All the socios must learn and speak the same language. The co-op that doesn't have a common language will fail. Once upon a time says the Bible, there were men who decided they were as powerful as God. To prove it they decided to build a tower which would reach to Heaven. They began to work, and after they had built several floors God decided to punish them for their sin of pride. One day He caused each one of the workers to start speaking a different language. Suddenly nobody could understand anyone else, and in a short while the workers began to fight among themselves. The work on the tower stopped forever. So it is with the co-op whose members don't learn to speak the same language of the estatutos.

9. Education: "A co-op which does not have an education committee is like a blind man." "The education committee is like the school teacher." There are some school teachers who are lazy and never give classes to the children. But there are other school teachers who realize that the youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow and so these good teachers sacrifice all their time to teach the children well, to teach them to be responsible, and hard-working. The co-op also, like a good school teacher, needs to constantly teach its members.

10. Politics: "The co-op house which opens its door to politics is like the man who tries to live with two wives under the same roof." "A co-op where politics thrive is like a tree with two trunks." "A politician inside a co-op is as dangerous as a wolf among a corral of chickens."

Several Cautions With Imagery

The Bible offers an unlimited supply of stories and parables which can be adapted to concepts Volunteers wish to communicate. However, it is important that the Volunteer never assume he has chosen a biblical story his listeners are certain to be familiar with. It is surprising how unfamiliar Peruvians are with the Bible.

Many Volunteers might feel they are "talking down" too much to their audience by using such simple stories and imagery. Although it is important to measure one's audience and to try to speak to the group and not to its lowest, most illiterate members, it is, nonetheless, generally true that simply imagery often holds in rapt attention, even well-educated professionals. If only half or one-third of one's audience stand in need of very basic, simplified communication, there is little risk in speaking to their level.

But this brings to mind a fundamental question which has been frequently raised concerning Volunteer work with groups, namely: Does the Volunteer place the emphasis of his time working with the broad membership of the group, or should he concentrate his work with group leaders or potential leaders? This question was discussed at length

with co-op Volunteers and the general concensus was the latter alternative. With specific reference to co-op education it was felt that it was the Volunteer's job to train the leaders to educate the body of the co-op members. In point of fact this task has proven extremely difficult, and co-ops with active education committees are very few indeed. Consequently, Volunteers have become increasingly involved in co-op education at the socio level, mainly through cursillos. At the same time it is becoming quite clear that co-op leaders, no matter how much expertise, are not by themselves able to "carry the co-op" indefinitely. They have to see results. They must see some compensation for their sacrifice. Leadership can not be sustained in a vacuum. Without a strong current of interest and participation on the part of the general membership, well-trained leaders can be wasted.

It is to develop this membership involvement that verbal imagery becomes so important. Imagery aids the socio's comprehension of what he is to participate in. Even though the socio may forget the concept expressed by an image, he may remember the image. Even failing at that, if the image is simple and clear it will be understood in the moment it is used. Comprehension, if only briefly, will occur, leaving the impression in the socio's mind that he has learned something. And this impression allows him to respond more positively to the co-op than if he has not understood anything. In the last analysis, then, imagery is intended to generate a climate of positive feeling, of comprehension. If such a climate can be built, good leadership can sustain it and perhaps enhance it.

John Hatch
Chiclayo, February 14, 1967

CONFRONTATION

Norman Cousins

Americans who come to Southeast Asia fortify themselves with all sorts of pharmaceutical armor. Their little vials are like prancing medieval steeds; they carry their owners into battle against all sorts of marauding bacteria. One disease, however, the intrepid little pills cannot conquer. This disease goes by the name of compassion fatigue or conscience sickness. When it strikes, it produces a violent retching of the spirit with an accompanying severe upset of the moral equilibrum. At first the eyelids stretch wide open, then they narrow in a desperate effort to seek cover from an abiding reality. There is no prescription except to tell the victim to lower his gaze, then bundle him gently and send him home.

Over the years, on various trips to the Far East and Middle East, I have watched the newcomers as they arrived. At first, there would be the full flush of exciting response to a powerful new experience. They would be caught up on the dramatic discovery of conspicuously different cultures. But then something would happen. They would be confronted by the evidence that, for the most part, the world is not congenial to life in human form. Conditioned by a society of abundance, the newcomers would be plummeted out of the sky into an area where the primary mystery of life is not how it originated but how it sustained. The newcomers would see men harnessed to wagons like dray horses; they are by far the cheapest form of hauling power available--cheaper then bullocks or horses and infinitely cheaper than trucks. Besides, human fuel requirements are far less costly than either engine or animal.

The newcomers would also see ten or twelve people or more sharing a single room--sometimes a shanty made of old crates or discarded tin. Some people either couldn't afford the flimsy crates or, finding them too crowded, would set up their frayed bedrolls in the streets. An American who worked for the United States Information Service in Calcutta told how shocked he was to stumble at night upon the sleeping form of an Indian on a sidewalk--and then to recognize him as one of the clerks who worked on the next floor.

To be sure, not all Americans are affected by compassion fatigue or conscience sickness. Many of them manage to make the adjustment. As would be expected in some cases, the initial blisters on the sensitivities become hardened, even calloused, through constant exposure. A few newcomers, however, achieve the seemingly impossible. They succeeded in retaining their sensitivity without narrowing their field of vision or turning away from life disfigured by hunger. The secret of their adjustment lies in their ability to attach themselves to a useful enterprise. They make important connections with the surrounding reality. They invest themselves in the human situation as they find it, working in the social services on the personal level or through the established agencies. They find their energy in a sustained purpose.

Soon, countless thousands of Americans will be serving in remote places in the world as part of the President's Peace Corps. The success of their mission may depend less on their specialized training than upon their view of life. Their highly developed skills will be meaningless unless their emotional and philosophical equipment is right for the job. This does not mean that the highly sensitized individual need not apply. On the contrary, a capacity for sensitive response is a prime qualification. But it should be the kind of sensitivity that leads neither to the softness of retreat nor the hardness of acclimation. Instead, the proper sensitivity will find its outlet in the work itself, deriving its sustaining power from the fact of an attack on a difficult human situation. The key is confrontation and not solution.

Indeed, nothing is more essential than the need to separate one's assignment from the total problem. I met a young American who decided to quit India after only

five months of service with a U.S. agricultural mission. "It's no use," he said, "you help one man only to discover fifty men standing behind him. Then you help fifty men and five thousand suddenly appear. You help the five thousand but what do you do about the five million behind them and the fifty million to follow? At some point along the line you decide it's hopeless."

Another American, an expert in housing, confessed that he, too, was about ready to give up. "Few nations in human history have made more progress in putting up new housing units than India," he said. "Last year, perhaps six to eight millions of people were able to move out of the impossibly overcrowded rooms and into decent quarters. But during the same time ten million people were added to the population. The result is that the country is at least two million people worse off than it was a year ago. Can you imagine what the deficit will be ten years from now? How can you help but be discouraged?"

A young American doctor attached to a hospital in Bombay said he was doing everything he could to hold fast to his original purpose in coming to India. "I just wasn't psychologically attuned to the problems I would have to face. Back in the United States, a doctor never has to ask himself: 'Why try to keep this baby alive?' He concentrates all his knowledge and will power on the need to save a child and give him a chance for a normal life. But here, in India, maybe two or three hundred million people will never experience a single day free of hunger or sickness in their entire lives."

The fallacy in the reasoning behind these various positions is that each man wanted the evidence of some visible amelioration of the total problem before he could justify his own efforts. Another mistake, perhaps, was that each man underestimated the power of his own example to set others in compassionate motion. Each of these men was part of a total process of creative efforts, the nature and scope of which were not wholly visible but were real and genuine nonetheless.

Finally, no one man involved in the vast and infinitely mysterious enterprise of reducing human pain really knows enough about the intangibles of social interaction to be pessimistic about the future. Progress proceeds out of elusive but vital fractions. Sudden spurts in the condition of a society come about as the result of small achievements with high symbolic content. The probability of such an upturn may be slight in any given situation. No matter. No one can take the responsibility for assuming it cannot happen. To do otherwise is to hold history in contempt. "I have tried," said Augustine, "to find the source of evil and I got nowhere."

Above article published in Saturday Review, March 25, 1961; © 1961 Saturday Review, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

IF YOU THINK IT WILL BE PICTURESQUE, FORGET IT

PCV Tom Carter
(Peru--1963)

I get a lot of letters from people saying "how exciting your work must be," "how picturesque," or "how much you must enjoy it." They read Peace Corps recruiting bulletins with pictures of volunteers hiking along in the Tanganyikan sunset, or teaching to eager, bright-eyed students, "battling Communism hand to hand." Fed with Peace Corps press releases about glory and rewards heaped upon volunteers by loving, thankful natives, and topped by a naive conclusion that what the world really needs is less "Stuffy old politicians" and more "real folks," they rush to the post office to send in the application. Volunteers call this the Albert Schweitzer complex. Though unfortunately incorrect, these dreams would still not be harmful were it not for what happens to the volunteer overseas and to his co-workers when he joins for these reasons.

I live in a picturesque bamboo mat house I built myself. I buy my water from a picturesque boy with a burro loaded down with water cans. I read and write under a kerosene lantern, sleep on a cot, and cook on a camp stove. Tourists and Reporters find this fascinating and "out-doorish" and envy my experience. They think I'm kidding when I suggest that we trade. How could I pass up living so picturesque! Their mat house would not be so picturesque during a 3:00 a.m. rainstorm, when water gets in the expensive cameras, or during the frequent dust storms that will stop up radios so they can't hear the Voice of America broadcasts. Their water boy won't be so picturesque either when they see where he gets his water, or their cot so "outdoorish" when they lie on it doubled up with dysentery.

There comes a day when all this suddenly becomes apparent, all at once. Things are no longer picturesque, they are dirty, no longer quaint but furiously frustrating, and you want like crazy to just get out of there, to go home. This is called culture shock and you don't find it mentioned on recruiting posters. It happens to one and all, usually about the third or fourth month. How hard it hits you and for how long depends largely on this problem of false motives. More volunteers quit and go home at this stage than any other. Unhappy, with a lot of time out of their lives wasted, full of bad memories of their experience, they fell victims to their own imagination. Others remain, but count the days until their two years are up, hating each day, souring themselves, their friends, and all the Peruvians they talk with. What a waste! Two years of their lives ruined by idealistic day-dreams and tragic misinformation, from both unofficial and official sources. Do I indict the Peace Corps and warn all to shy clear? No, on the contrary, I invite, more, I challenge you to apply. If you're a tough minded realist remembering it's for two long years of hard work, not a junior year abroad, you'll have a rewarding, maturing experience second to none. If you think it will be thrilling, or picturesque, or a good story for your friends back home, forget it. We don't want you down here, and you wouldn't like it anyway.

Now that I've had my chance at the pulpit, let me tell you what I do down here. I'm involved in a program of "Urban Community Development." I live in a giant slum or barriada, on the edge of Chimbote, a city of 120,000 people. The movie "Black Orpheus" showed another barriada, more colorful but otherwise similar to mine. My neighbors have come down from the mountains, attracted by the money and in hope of a better life. Because of a lack of marketable skills, for generations they have known only farming and grazing, they find it hard to get a job and end up in unbelievable slums, with disease and starvation rampant. Largely illiterate and sometimes only speaking Spanish as a second language after their Indian tongue, they get almost no public service, and many of their rights aren't protected. The slums around Chinbote stretch for miles and miles, staggering the imagination.

My job is to get these people, my neighbors, organized, to make them better able to compete in the city for their rights, and to try and get them to raise their standard of living back to the human race. I teach in the local school during the days and I teach carpentry to adults at night. Both are important jobs, but I consider them only a front. Teaching kids, while fun for me and hilarious for the rough housing students, is only an excuse for being in the barriada.

For example, our school has no roof. It would be a ten dollar project and about one day's labor for 2 or 3 Peace Corpsmen to build that roof. Yet we don't do it. If we gave my school a roof it would always be that, a gift, the Gringo's roof. When it needed fixing, no one would fix it. If it takes me a year to talk my neighbors into putting on that roof it will be worth it. Because it will then be their roof on their school. It would be a small start, but in the right direction. Maybe then we'll take on a little harder project, and step by step build up a powerful organization that is interested in progress and strong enough to do something about it. It has to be an organization that doesn't need me, however, otherwise it would collapse when I leave.

In another barriada in my town, there are two schools side by side. One is a several thousand dollar complex with classrooms, meeting halls, and a medical clinic. It was built, brick, by Peace Corps Volunteers, laboring day and night for six months. Architects labored with social workers, pouring cement, laying concrete blocks, putting in lights and plumbing. It is now completed and in partial use. Peruvians call it the "gringo school." Not one Peruvian ever lifted a finger to help build that school and it will crumble back to dust before one Peruvian will lift one finger to repair it. Though highly touted in the U.S. press as another example of the Peace Corps in action, this school is an utter failure. Yes, there is a school there, and now kids can go to school, but what has it really done? Nothing, the building is just another example of Uncle Sugar with a great big Alliance for Progress sticker on it.

Next door to this complex stands a two-room school, built out of grass mats, without windows or lights and a dirt floor. It was built because the barriada grew and because classroom space was needed. The teacher, a Peace Corps Volunteer, talked the parents of the students into building those two rooms. The school was put up in one day. Volunteers only gave limited aid in construction. I consider the grass-school a success, and ten times more valuable to the community than the big complex it sits next to. Now, the grass school is being replaced by another massive school, with Alliance for Progress money, but without Peace Corps help. Even with the grass school gone, I still think it will remain a symbol to the barriada people of what they can do--working together.

A volunteer has to be careful, however, and not become too much of a leader. I have said, if I stir up all the action, what will happen when I leave? I hint at things and let my neighbors come up with the ideas and I let them lead the action. A really good Peace Corps program receives little credit. Keep that in mind when you read Peace Corps success stories. This then, in short, is what I try to do in Barrio San Pedro. I have a lot of failures, few tangible successes, and a great deal of frustration. (I was a dreamer once too, and my fall was hard.) Now, all things considered, I think I'm doing something worthwhile. I don't think I'll sign up for another stint, but you couldn't drag me away from this one!